Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

JEFFERSON-PILOT INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. C-1-02-479

CHRISTOPHER L. KEARNEY,

Defendant.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM

DEMPSEY, a Witness, taken on behalf of the

Defendant before Mary Lynn Cushing, CSR, CCR No.

1077, pursuant to Notice on the 13th day of

June, 2007, at the Law Offices of Stinson,

Morrison, Hecker, LLP, 1201 Walnut Street, Suite

2900, Kansas City, Missouri, 64106.

	Page 2					Page 4
1	APPEARANCES	1	INDEX CONTINUED:	M	IARKED:	IDENTIFIED:
2	THI LA HOLLO	2	Dempsey Exhibit 16	61	97	
3	Appearing for Jefferson-Pilot	3	Dempsey Exhibit 17	61	99	
4	Insurance Company and Disability Management	4	Dempsey Exhibit 18	61	99	
5	Services was Mr. John E. Meagher of Shutts &	5	Dempsey Exhibit 19	61	100	
6	Bowen, LLP., 1500 Miami Center, 201 South	6	Dempsey Exhibit 20	61	100	
	Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Florida, 33131	7	Dempsey Exhibit 22	61	101	
7	Appearing telephonically for	8	Dempsey Exhibit 23	61		
8	•••	9	Dempsey Exhibit 24	61	105	
9	Jefferson-Pilot Insurance Company was Ms. Stephanie T. Farabow, 826 North Elm Street,	10	Dempsey Editor 21	01	100	
10	Greensboro, North Carolina, 27401.	11	(Exhibits filed with the	. Orioi	nal)	
11		12	(LAMOIS INCC WILL AN	Ong.	11411)	
12	Appearing telephonically for	13				
13	Disability Management Services was Mr. Adam	13				
14	Formus, Legal Counsel, of Disability Management	15				
15	Services, 1391 Main Street, Suite 1600,	16				
16	Springfield, Massachusetts, 01103.	17				
17	Appearing for William Dempsey was Mr.	17				
18	Bruce E. Baty of Stinson, Morrison, Hecker, LLP,	18				
19	1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900, Kansas City,	20				
20	Missouri.	ŧ				
21	Appearing for Christopher Kearney was	21				
22	Mr. Michael A. Roberts of Graydon, Head &	22				
23	Ritchey, LLP, 1900 Fifth Third Center, 511	23				
24	Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202.	24				
25		25				
	Page 3					Page 5
1	Also present was Jeremy Martin,	1	(Deposition of			
2	Videographer of Metropolitan Court Reporters,	2	MR. MART			
3	Inc., 9200 Indian Creek Parkway, Suite 205,	3	videotaped deposition			
4	Overland Park, Kansas, 66210.	4	No. C-1-02-479. Tod			
5	INDEX CONTINUED:	5	2007. The time is now			
6	WITNESS: PAGE:	6	Standard Time. We a	_	-	
7	WILLIAM DEMPSEY	7	Counsel, would you p	lease	state you	r
8	Examination by Mr. Roberts 6	8	appearances.			•
9		9	MR. MEAG			-
10	EXHIBITS: MARKED: IDENTIFIED:	10	representing Jefferson		and Disa	ability
11	Dempsey Exhibit 1 42 61	11	Management Services			
12	Dempsey Exhibit 2 42 42	12	MR. BATY		-	
13	Dempsey Exhibit 3 61 81	13	representing the witne		-	
14	Dempsey Exhibit 4 61	14	MR. ROBE			letendant
15	Dempsey Exhibit 5 61 83	15	Chris Kearney is Mike			1
16	Dempsey Exhibit 6 61 83	16	MR. MART		-	ant the
17	Dempsey Exhibit 7 61 85	17	appearing by phone to			
18	Dempsey Exhibit 8 61 90	18	MR. MEAG		_	-
19	Dempsey Exhibit 9 61 92	19	Adam Formus of Disa		-	
20	Dempsey Exhibit 10 61 94	20	and Stephanie Farabo			
21	Dempsey Exhibit 11 61 94	21	MR. MART			ı. Would
22	Dempsey Exhibit 12 61 96	22	you please swear in th			
23	Dempsey Exhibit 13 61 97	23	WILLIAM			
24	Dempsey Exhibit 14 61 97	24	being first duly sworn	i, testi	fied unde	er oath as
25	Dempsey Exhibit 15 61 97	25	follows:			

	Page 6	-	Page 8
1	EXAMINATION	1	the company. And then it become ERAC, Employers
2	BY MR. ROBERTS:	2	Reassurance Corporation.
3	Q. Good afternoon, sir, my name is Mike	3	Q. Change one vowel?
4	Roberts. I'm a lawyer and I represent Chris	4	A. Add one, yes. Instead of ERC it's
5	Kearney in a lawsuit pending in the State of	5	ERAC.
6	Ohio Federal Court there.	6	Q. Who did you report to when you started
7	Could you please state your name and	7	at ERC?
8	address for the record, please?	8	A. Robert Lainner.
9	A. William Edward Dempsey, D-E-M-P-S-E-Y.	9	Q. Is Mr. Lainner a lawyer?
10	Q. Mr. Dempsey, I understand that you have	10	A. No.
11	a law degree?	11	Q. What was his position then?
12	A. Yes.	12	A. Assistant Vice-President.
13	Q. Where did you go to law school?	13	Q. Lainner is L-a-i-n-n-e-r?
14	A. Washburn Law school in Topeka, Kansas.	14	A. Correct.
15	Q. What year did you graduate?	15	Q. And he was Assistant Vice-President at
16	A. 1990.	16	ERC?
17	Q. As did I. Tell me your employment	17	A. Correct.
18	history since 1990?	18	Q. And did he remain your superior until
19	A. I worked for the Kansas Insurance	19	the transaction you described earlier with Swiss
20	Department from 19 well, until 1993, until	20	Re?
21	September of 1993. And I went to work for a	21	A. He was my supervisor until
22	company called US Physicians Mutual Risk	22	approximately two years ago and they had a
23	Retention Group in Kansas City in September of	23	company reorganization. And so both Bob Lainner
24	1993 and was employed there until May of 1996.	24	and myself report to another person now. We're
25	In May of 1996 I accepted a position with Smith	25	on the same level. They flattened the
	Page 7		Page 9
1	Staffing Services in Wichita, Kansas, and I	1	organization so to speak. So instead of having
2	worked there until October of 2006, at which	2	myself and several people report to Bob, we just
3	time I accepted a position with Employers	3	now report to a different individual.
4	Reinsurance Corporation in Overland Park,	4	Q. In the last two years who is it you
5	Kansas, and I've been employed there since.	5	have been reporting to?
6	Q. Did you say Employers Reinsurance or	6	A. Tom Felgate.
7	Employees Reassurance?	7	Q. Can you spell that last name, please?
8	A. Employees Reinsurance.	8	A. F-e-l-g-a-t-e.
9	Q. R-E-I.	9	Q. What is Mr. Felgate's position?
10	A. R-e-i-n-s-u-r-a-n-c-e. The corporation	10	A. He is the head of the life and health
11	was purchased by Swiss Re, a good portion of the	11	claims area for Employers Reassurance
12	corporation was purchased by Swiss Re. The sale	12	Corporation.
13	closed in late June of 2006 and the life and	13	Q. Is he also a Vice-President?
14	health portion of the business became Employers	14	A. I don't know if he has that title.
15	Reassurance Corporation.	15	Q. What is your title presently?
16	Q. You're getting ahead of me a little	16	A. Claims counsel.
17	bit?	17	Q. What has your title been along the
18	A. I apologize.	18	progression from October of '96 through today?
19	Q. I may have written this down	19	A. The same.
20	incorrectly. Did you say you were at Smith	20	Q. Did the company have a general counsel,
21	Staffing from May of '96 to October of '96?	21	someone filling that title?
22	A. Correct.	22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And then from October of '96 through	23	Q. Who was that?
24	the present it's been Employers Reinsurance?	24	A. I can't remember the individual's name
25	A. It was Reinsurance until the sale of	25	when I first started there. And it's been

	Page 10		Page 12
1	bracketed Dennison & Woods General Electric of	1	Q. You're mindful that this particular
2	recent years. I take it back, John Conley was	2	litigation concerns a long term disability or
3	general counsel with ERC when I began there. He	3	residual disability insurance policy?
4	retired after I was there for five or six years	4	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
5	and I can't recall the name of the gentleman	5	A. Yes.
6	that took I take it back again. Nick Spaeth,	6	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Are those types of
7	S-p-a-e-t-h. And I'm not sure who succeeded	7	policies the only types of insurance policies
8	Mr. Spaeth in that position since then.	8	that you have had responsibility for since '96?
9	Q. And then the next time your employer	9	A. No.
10	had a general counsel would be with GE in the	10	Q. What kind of insurance policies have
11	past two years?	11	you had responsibility for since '96?
12	A. Right. They recently retained an	12	A. Life insurance, critical illness, long
13	individual by the name of Katherine Russell out	13	term care, group excuse me, group disability
14	of our Indianapolis office to fill that position	14	and individual disability and occasionally some
15	for our new entity. We've not had a person in	15	medical claims.
16	that position since we've been ERAC, so they	16	Q. So this fits within the individual
17	just recently put that person in that position.	17	disability arena?
18	Q. Let's go back to '96 to the timeframe	18	A. Yes.
19	prior to the transaction between Swiss Re and	19	Q. Were there other lawyers at ERC from
20	whoever else. Were you in the General Counsel	20	'96 to 2004 that also had responsibilities for
21	Office during that period or were you outside	21	individual disability claims?
22	that office?	22	A. Yes.
23	A. I was outside that office.	23	Q. Who were they?
24	Q. How many lawyers were in that office?	24	A. David Newkirk.
25	A. I don't know.	25	Q. Anyone else?
	Page 11		Page 13
1	Q. Why were you not in the General Counsel	1	A. Not that I recall. Can I correct that?
$\frac{1}{2}$	Office during that '96 through 2004 period?	2	Q. Absolutely.
3	A. I don't know.	3	A. I do recall one individual who had some
4	Q. Were there other lawyers like you who	4	involvement with individual, but was primarily
5	were not inside the General Counsel Office at	5	focused on the group disability claims, a person
6	ERC?	6	by the name of Dan Schlep, S-c-h-l-e-p. Also
7	A. Yes.	7	had a limited amount of involvement with
8	Q. Was Mr. Newkirk a lawyer like you	8	individual disability.
9	outside the General Counsel Office?	9	Q. Thank you. Have you ever given a
10	A. Yes.	10	deposition before?
11	Q. Was he also a claims counsel?	11	A. Yes.
12	A. I believe David's title was Assistant	12	Q. How many occasions?
13	Vice-President at that time I came into the	13	A. One.
14	organization.	14	Q. Have you ever testified at a trial?
15	Q. But you didn't report to him?	15	A. Yes.
16	A. No.	16	Q. Was the deposition in an individual
17	Q. Did you ever report to him?	17	disability case?
18	A. No.	18	A. It related to individual disability
19	Q. Was there ever an occasion where he	19	cases, but it did not concern one specific
20	reported to you?	20	disability case.
21	A. No.	21	Q. What type of proceeding or action was
22	Q. Did you work on files with Mr. Newkirk?	22	it?
23	A. My job duties were similar to	23	A. It was a contract action between
24	Mr. Newkirk's. However, I guess I'm not certain	24	Employers Reassurance Corporation and one of the
25	what you mean by work on files.	25	companies that we do business with.

	Page 14		Page 16
1	Q. Jefferson-Pilot?	1	Q. I asked you a negative question. Do
2	A. No.	2	you know what the reason for that was?
3	Q. What was the other company?	3	A. The reason for what?
4	A. Mass Mutual.	4	Q. Why that was not part of the
5	Q. Was that proceeding here in Kansas?	5	transaction that particular block of business?
6	A. No.	6	A. I heard some reasons, but I don't know
7	Q. Where was it?	7	that they are I wasn't involved in the
8	A. Western District of Missouri.	8	negotiations, so I can't tell you other than
9	Q. What year?	9	hearsay.
10	A. Filed in 2006, February of 2006 I	10	Q. You're mindful that Mr. Kearney's
11	believe.	11	insurer is Jefferson-Pilot, right?
12	Q. It's gone to trial already?	12	A. I'm aware that Mr. Kearney has a policy
13	A. No, it's in discovery.	13	issued by Jefferson-Pilot.
14	Q. That's the case you gave your	14	Q. Can you describe for the jury what
15	deposition in?	15	ERC's now ERAC's relationship is with
16	A. Yes.	16	Jefferson-Pilot as it would concern Mr. Kearney?
17	Q. What type of proceeding did you testify	17	A. There's a reinsurance agreement between
18	at trial?	18	Jefferson-Pilot and ERC that provides that ERC
19	A. A matter involving an insurance	19	reimburses a percentage of loss on claims.
20	receivership.	20	Q. Across an entire spectrum of policies
21	Q. Is Employers Reinsurance Corporation a	21	that have been sold by Jefferson-Pilot?
22	plaintiff in the Western District of Missouri	22	A. Within a timeframe. I don't recall the
23	case?	23	exact period that it was involved, but ERC has
24	A. Yes. It actually, I take that back.	24	reinsured the Jefferson-Pilot block since
25	It may be Employers Reassurance Corporation,	25	sometime in the 1960's I believe.
	Page 15		Page 17
1	ERAC. I'm getting confused by my own acronyms	1	Q. And I presume that in the 60's there
2	here. It's Employers Reassurance Corporation.	2	was some large agreement that lawyers helped
3	Q. Does the action concern rights and	3	create and probably been modified or amended
4	responsibilities between the insurer Mass Mutual	4	coming forward to 2007?
5	and the reinsurer ERC or ERAC?	5	A. There's a reinsurance agreement between
6	A. Yes. It is a contract action.	6	the parties, yes.
7	Q. Is General Electric the owner or is	7	Q. The parties being ERC and
8	ERAC a subsidiary of General Electric?	8	Jefferson-Pilot?
9	A. Yes, ultimately.	9	A. Correct.
10	Q. How long has that been the case?	10	Q. And under that agreement, does ERC,
111	A. I believe General Electric purchased	11	subsidiary of General Electric, have 80 percent
12	Employers Reinsurance Corporation in 1984 or	12	of the obligation on claims like Mr. Kearney's
13	'85. I don't know the exact date, but that's a	13	that have been made under the insurance policy?
14	ballpark figure.	14	A. The reimbursement under the reinsurance
15	Q. So throughout your tenure with ERC or	15	agreement varies according to the date of loss.
16 17	ERAC, it's been a subsidiary of GE? A. Correct.	16 17	Q. I saw some references in the documents
18	Q. And in 2004 a company affiliated with	18	produced to me a week ago that it's 80 percent or so in Mr. Kearney's case. Is that correct as
19	Swiss Re purchased some of the business that had	19	far as you know?
20	been traditionally within ERC?	20	A. I don't know.
21	A. Actually, I believe it is Swiss Re	21	Q. So depending on when Mr. Kearney
22	themselves that made the purchase.	22	purchased his policy would direct how much, what
23	Q. But that purchase did not concern	23	percentage of the obligation ERC would have
24	individual disability reinsurance?	24	versus Jefferson-Pilot should he ever file a
25	A. No, it did not.	25	claim, is that accurate?
L	109 10 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110		, um woulde.

Page 18 1 A. No. 2 Q. Can you tell the Court or the jury how 3 this reinsurance agreement works when someone

- A. It would be triggered by the date of loss and the amount of the retention that Jefferson-Pilot had on the claim at that point in time.
- Q. Can you tell the jury what retention means?

like Mr. Kearney files a claim?

- A. Retention is the amount of the overall risk that is kept by Jefferson-Pilot and the balance is paid by Employers Reinsurance Corporation.
- Q. Do you know what the retention was on Mr. Kearney's claim?
- A. No, I don't.
 - Q. Is that something that is dictated by the reinsurance agreement based on his date of loss?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. Are you mindful Mr. Kearney is getting paid benefits today and has been receiving benefits for 14 years?
 - A. I'm aware that Mr. Kearney is receiving

Page 20

- front of the jury is that you don't know what percentage of Mr. Kearney's claim is on your company's nickel versus Jefferson-Pilot's nickel?
- 5 MR. MEAGHER: Objection, asked 6 and answered.
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Is your company'sresponsibility more or less than 50 percent?
- 10 A. I believe it's more than that, more 11 than 50 percent?
 - Q. Is it more or less than 75?
 - A. I don't know.
 - Q. Can you tell the jury what the word ceded means?
 - A. Ceded in the reinsurance context means the amount of a given loss that an insurer, such as Jefferson-Pilot, would cede to a reinsurer, such as Employers Reinsurance Corporation, meaning that a percentage of the loss is in exchange for a percentage of the premium is paid by the reinsurer.
- Q. So let's try to say that in a way that
 I can understand. Are you saying that insurance
 companies sell policies to Joe Smith. And in

Page 19

Page 21

- benefits and has been receiving them since sometime in the 1990's. I'm not sure of the exact date of loss.
- Q. Can you tell the jury what percentage of those benefit payments are the responsibility of ERAC today versus Jefferson-Pilot?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Why not?
- A. I don't know what the retention is on his particular claim.
- Q. Sir, every month for several years you've been involved in correspondence and e-mails regarding Mr. Kearney's claim in this litigation, correct?
- A. I've been involved in numerous e-mails and correspondences over the course of time, yes.
- Q. We can go through the privilege log.
 You've been involved every month for years in this claim, right?

MR. MEAGHER: Objection, asked and answered.

- 23 Q. Correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. (By Mr. Roberts) And your testimony in

that policy the insured, the individual says
"I'll pay you so much premium if you promise to
pay me so much of a benefit if I ever have a
claim."

And then what the insurance company does is goes to a reinsurer like ERAC and says "Hey, we have this block of policies that we intend to sell or we have sold. It's going to bring us X amount premium dollars a year. We will give you so much percentage of that if you agree to accept the risk when people file claims under this block." Is that kind of an accurate description of what's going on?

- A. In essence the reinsurer accepts part of the risk in return for part of the premium.
- Q. So on this particular type of policy that Mr. Kearney purchased from Jefferson-Pilot, because of the type of policy it is during the time period he purchased it, and the period he filed a claim, ERC and now ERAC has had a greater than 50 percent stake in the payment of benefits to Mr. Kearney, is that correct?
- A. Can you restate that, please? I want to make sure I understand exactly what you're saying.

1 1	Page 22		Page 24
	Q. Given the facts before us, the type of	1	Q. I'm speaking generally. I'm not
2	policy Mr. Kearney purchased, the date he	2	speaking about Mr. Kearney's policy
3	purchased it, the particular riders he	3	specifically. I'm sorry if I confused you.
4	purchased, the amounts of the claim, the date he	4	If John Doe, Jefferson-Pilot
5	filed the loss, given all those things, because	5	policyholder, were to file a claim or had a
6	of this agreement between this General Electric	6	claim pending since '96, would that claim
7	subsidiary and Jefferson-Pilot, your company,	7	necessarily be something that you would have
8	the General Electric subsidiary, has greater	8	responsibility for here as the reinsurer?
9	than 50 percent of the responsibility to pay the	9	A. No.
10	claim monetarily ultimately?	10	Q. Why not?
11	A. Pursuant to the terms of the	11	A. It's not my job to adjudicate the
12	reinsurance agreement, ERC has a percentage of	12	claims.
13	the loss, which to my recollection is greater	13	Q. I didn't say adjudicate. When would
14	than 50 percent.	14	you have any involvement in John Doe's
15	Q. And since the time that Mr. Kearney	15	Jefferson-Pilot claim?
16	purchased his claim, your company, the General	16	A. In which context, with Jefferson-Pilot
17	Electric subsidiary, has been receiving a	17	or DMS?
18	percentage of the premium dollars that he's	18	Q. Let's talk about the period prior to
19	paid, true? Is that correct?	19	2000.
20	A. I can only assume so. I don't know	20	A. I would look at claims sometimes at the
21	that for a fact.	21	request of Jefferson-Pilot. Sometimes I would
22	Q. So tell the jury what you do as claims	22	visit Greensboro and we would look at a list of
23	counsel for ERC?	23	claims. We would pick out a random list of
24	A. I work with the companies that we	24	claims to examine and that was the extent of my
25	reinsure. I go out and look at the claims that	25	involvement. It would just be to review the
	Page 23		Page 25
1	are incurred on occasions. Sometimes they are	1	contents of the claim file.
2	sent to my office. Just depends on the nature	2	Q. Your testimony to the jury is you would
3	of the reinsurance agreement.	3	from time to time go and perform somewhat of an
4	Q. I'm not sure I fully understood you.	4	audit function in Greensboro of the
5	Your responsibilities go beyond just the	5	Jefferson-Pilot claims?
6	individual disability insurance policies that	6	A. A review would probably be a more apt
7	Jefferson-Pilot sold, correct?	7	description of what we did. We would review the
8	A. Correct.	8	contents of the claim file.
9	Q. Although that is within your	9	Q. Is your testimony that this review
10	responsibility, you also cover these other types	10	would be entirely random, or would you go to
11	of insurance, life, long term care, the others	11	North Carolina from Kansas with the intention of
12	you described to me?	12	looking at specific claims that you would
13	A. Correct.	13	identify?
14	Q. But when a policyholder of a	14	A. We would have identified claims ahead
15	Jefferson-Pilot policy files a claim, that would	15	of time for Jefferson-Pilot to have ready, to
16	come within your area of responsibility as the	16	have them pulled so that we wouldn't have to do
17	reinsurer, is that right?	17	it when we got there. So we would identify a
1	A. No.	18	list of claims for them.
18	Q. What about that question was not	19	Q. Did you randomly identify the claims or
18 19	name at 9		were they claims that you specifically
18 19 20	correct?	20	
18 19 20 21	A. I don't have direct involvement with	21	identified for reasons?
18 19 20 21 22	A. I don't have direct involvement with the claim per se. The claim was sent initially	21 22	identified for reasons? A. A combination.
18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I don't have direct involvement with the claim per se. The claim was sent initially to Jefferson-Pilot. Subsequent to January of	21 22 23	identified for reasons?A. A combination.Q. Did you ever do that with regard to
18 19 20 21 22	A. I don't have direct involvement with the claim per se. The claim was sent initially	21 22	identified for reasons? A. A combination.

	Page 26	-	Page 28
1	Mr. Kearney's claim in it's entirety. I can't	1	records, but I'm not a pricing or reserving
2	tell you that I did or did not. I honestly	2	actuary, so I can't really address that.
3	don't recall.	3	Q. I'm not asking you to opine for me.
4	Q. So your involvement in the	4	Just based on your knowledge, did ERC maintain a
5	Jefferson-Pilot insured claims would be either	5	reserve for its portion of the liability on a
6	at Jefferson-Pilot's invitation, or you might	6	claim and Jefferson-Pilot maintain its own
7	identify a claim that's been pending that you	7	reserve for its portion of the liability on a
8	want to take a look at, or you could randomly	8	claim?
9	just go to Greensboro and do an audit of a	9	A. I believe Jefferson-Pilot maintains a
10	claim?	10	reserve and then takes a credit on their annual
11	A. I could randomly identify certain	11	statement for reinsurance agreements. ERC also
12	claims and examine them when I got there, yes.	12	or ERC carries a reserve commensurate with
13	Q. Did the situation ever exist where	13	their liability on a block of business.
14	did Jefferson-Pilot have a duty to report to the	14	Q. So once a claim is made, ERC, someone
15	reinsurer new claims that were filed, amounts of	15	outside of your department, presumably somebody
16	indemnity, what percentage ERC had to pay versus	16	in the actuary department, makes some assessment
17	what percentage JP had to pay?	17	of what the reserve is that should be carried by
18	A. Jefferson-Pilot has an obligation under	18	ERC, at least prior to 2000?
19	the reinsurance agreement to place ERC on notice	19	A. That would be my understanding.
20	of events likely to lead to liability. So you	20	Q. And then that person, John Doe's claim,
21	can, I guess, interpret that to mean a lot of	21	would be in some directory or log of the pending
22	different things. But that's essentially the	22	claims on which reserves need to be maintained?
23	wording of the reinsurance agreement.	23	A. I believe so.
24	Q. Do you understand that agreement then	24	Q. In your capacity as claims counsel,
25	to require JP to notify you when a claim is	25	would you then use that information you had
	Page 27		Page 29
1	filed by an insured under an individual	1	internally at ERC to identify claims on which
2	disability policy?	2	you desired greater information from
3	A. I believe so.	3	Jefferson-Pilot?
4	Q. And then is there some tracking system	4	A. That a reserve is a factor we would
5	at ERC to follow how that claim develops and how	5	consider among other factors, but it was not a
6	it's adjudicated by Jefferson-Pilot at least	6	determinant in and of itself.
7	prior to 2000?	7	Q. Thank you for your answer. Actually
8	A. No.	8	that wasn't my question. But once a claim is
9	Q. What do you do with that information	9	reported to ERC, there is some monitoring of
10	when you get the notice from Jefferson-Pilot?	10	that or reflection of that in ERC's own business
11	A. Those were primarily used for billing	11	records, right?
12	purposes and to establish the appropriate	12	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
13	reserves.	13	A. I'm not sure what you mean by
14	Q. Did ERC establish its own reserves	14	monitoring. I mean the numbers are what they
15	regardless of what Jefferson-Pilot may have	15	are. They're formulated. They are derived from
16	reserved?	16	the Commissioners of Insurance Disability
17	A. I believe we use the information from	17	Tables, and so they are what they are. They are
18	the insurer to establish the reserve. And I	18	not something that are subject to change by an
19	think we may have also had formulas based on	19	individual on any basis. You just plug the data
20	experience that we applied in addition to	20	in and the reserve is what it is.
21	strengthen reserves.	21	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) That wasn't my
22	Q. So did the situation where ERC	22	question. My question was if, say, in '96 there
23	maintained its own reserve on a claim and	23	were 273 claims pending at Jefferson-Pilot on
24	Jefferson-Pilot maintained its own reserve?	24	which the subsidiary of General Electric had
25	A. Both companies maintain their own	25	reinsurance obligations, would all 273 of those

	Page 30	1	D 22
			Page 32
	names appear in some business record of ERC?	1	of that relationship to be?
$\frac{2}{2}$	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	2	A. I, as I understand it, they had a
3	A. Yes.	3	consulting agreement with Disability Management
4	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Would all of the	4	Services.
5	claim files associated with those hypothetical	5	Q. "They" meaning
6	273 claimants been housed at ERC?	6	A. ERC.
7	A. We don't typically have claim files on	7	Q ERC. Is ERC and ERAC different
8	individual claims at ERC.	8	companies or just a name change?
9	Q. Well, in this lawsuit I served a	9	A. ERAC was a wholly-owned subsidiary of
10	subpoena and last week there was over, I think	10	ERC at one point in time for business reasons
11	3600 pages of information produced by your	11	and the way they compartmentalized the various
12	company regarding Mr. Kearney. Do you have that	12	lines of business that they engaged in.
13	volume of information regarding claimants on	13	Q. Okay. So ERC entered some kind of
14	which you reinsure?	14	consulting agreement with Disability Management
15	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to the	15	Services in about '96 or '97, is that right?
16	form. You may answer.	16	A. I don't know when the agreement was
17	A. It would probably depend on the claim.	17	entered into, but it existed at the time I began
18	I suspect the reason there were 3600 pages as	18	my employment.
19	you state with respect to this claim is because	19	Q. And can you tell the jury what you
20	it's in litigation.	20	understand to be the main points of that
21	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) You said that you	21	agreement?
22	might go out and look at a claim. And under	22	A. I only know that ERC had that
23	some agreement with your company's clients, you	23	agreement. I really I don't I never
24	send this is sent to the office depending on	24	reviewed the document. I don't know anything
25	reinsurance agreements. What did you mean by	25	about it.
	Page 31		Page 33
1	that?	1	Q. As you understand the agreement just
2	A. On some reinsurance agreements	2	the way it works without reading it, was it a
3	particularly where a company is engaging in a	3	situation where ERC would select certain claims
4	line of business that they are not perhaps	4	for review by DMS whether they be
5	accustom to marketing such as critical illness,	5	Jefferson-Pilot insureds or Mass Mutual insureds
6	ERC would have the right to review the claim	6	or other clients of ERC?
7	before a decision is made in that matter.	7	A. I don't know what the process was.
8	Q. What did you mean by it's sent to this	8	Q. You do know that Mr. Kearney's claim
9	office depending on the reinsurance agreement.	9	was selected for review by DMS pursuant to the
10	The entire claim file gets sent to ERC or ERAC?	10	EDC 14' 1100"
		ì	ERC consulting agreement entered about 1997,
11	A. The information that the insurer has	11	right?
12	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be	11 12	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
12 13	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review.	11 12 13	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't
12 13 14	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case?	11 12 13 14	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became
12 13 14 15	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No.	11 12 13 14 15	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with
12 13 14 15 16	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir?	11 12 13 14 15 16	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim.
12 13 14 15 16 17	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University. Q. In addition to having this business	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim in 1997 or was that Mr. Newkirk?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University. Q. In addition to having this business relationship with Jefferson-Pilot in 1996 or	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim in 1997 or was that Mr. Newkirk? A. I believe that was Mr. Newkirk.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University. Q. In addition to having this business relationship with Jefferson-Pilot in 1996 or 1997, did your company have a business	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim in 1997 or was that Mr. Newkirk? A. I believe that was Mr. Newkirk. Q. Did there come a point where
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University. Q. In addition to having this business relationship with Jefferson-Pilot in 1996 or 1997, did your company have a business relationship with Disability Management	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim in 1997 or was that Mr. Newkirk? A. I believe that was Mr. Newkirk. Q. Did there come a point where Mr. Newkirk relinquished that responsibility to
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University. Q. In addition to having this business relationship with Jefferson-Pilot in 1996 or 1997, did your company have a business relationship with Disability Management Services?	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim in 1997 or was that Mr. Newkirk? A. I believe that was Mr. Newkirk. Q. Did there come a point where Mr. Newkirk relinquished that responsibility to you?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. The information that the insurer has gathered with respect to the claim would be forwarded to our offices for review. Q. Did that happen in Mr. Kearney's case? A. No. Q. Where did you go to college, sir? A. I graduated from Fort Hays State University. Q. In addition to having this business relationship with Jefferson-Pilot in 1996 or 1997, did your company have a business relationship with Disability Management	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	right? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I know that DMS was involved. I don't know how it Mr. Kearney's claim became involved, or how DMS became involved with Mr. Kearney's claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you the point person for JP with regard to Mr. Kearney's claim in 1997 or was that Mr. Newkirk? A. I believe that was Mr. Newkirk. Q. Did there come a point where Mr. Newkirk relinquished that responsibility to

<u> </u>	Page 34		Page 36
1	A. I believe it was in 1998.	1	A. Mr. Meagher and Mr. Baty.
2	Q. What precipitated that?	2	Q. Did you review documents during the
3	A. I really don't know.	3	course of yesterday's preparation with the six
4	Q. He just came into your office one day	4	lawyers?
5	and said "Here, I want you to have that client.	5	A. I reviewed a document.
6	I don't want to deal with it anymore?"	6	Q. Just one document?
7	A. No.	7	A. Just one document.
8	Q. Do you recall how it happened?	8	Q. What was that?
9	A. I recall having the responsibility for	9	A. It was a piece of correspondence from
10	the Jefferson-Pilot account given to me sometime	10	Valerie Loftin to Bob Bonzell.
11	in 1998.	11	Q. Do you know if that was produced
12	Q. What did you do in preparation for	12	pursuant to the subpoena or identified in the
13	today's deposition, sir?	13	privilege log?
14	A. I spoke with counsel yesterday. That's	14	A. I believe it was both produced and
15	essentially it.	15	identified. I have not seen the privilege log,
16	Q. You're referring to?	16	so I don't know.
17	A. I'm referring to Mr. Baty and Mr.	17	Q. You believe it was produced to me and
18	Meagher.	18	then also identified in the privilege log?
19	Q. You met with the two of them yesterday?	19	A. I believe it was produced in the course
20	A. That is correct.	20	of the documents that I provided to counsel.
21	Q. For how long?	21	And I believe it has been identified as a
22	A. Probably five hours including lunch.	22	privilege document. Again, I've not reviewed
23	Q. Did anyone else participate during the	23	the privilege log, so
24	course of that five-hour meeting with two	24	Q. Mr. Bonzell's name doesn't appear in
25	lawyers?	25	the privilege log. Why don't we I'm going to
	Page 35		Page 37
	A. Yes.	1	give you the privilege log and we will mark it
	Q. Who else?	2	as one. And then you take some time to review
$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	A. Mr. Formus and Ms. Farabow and	3	it and we will go off the video record while
3	Mr. Ellis for a very brief period of time, and	4	you're doing that. And it will give you a break
4 5	Mr. Cohen for a brief period of time.	5	as well. Fair enough?
5 6	O. So you're a lawyer and yesterday you	6	A. Sure.
7	met with those six lawyers?	7	MR. MARTIN: Time is now 12:53.
8	A. That's correct.	8	And we're going off the record.
9	Q. Preparing for today's depo?	9	(Off the record)
10	A. That is correct.	10	MR. MARTIN: The time is now
11	Q. And did you meet today with your	11	1:09. We're back on the record.
12	counsel in preparation for the deposition?	12	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, while we
13	A. I spoke with him briefly before we came	13	were off the record you had an opportunity to
14	to this floor for the meeting. For the	14	look at the privilege log as produced and then
15	deposition I should say.	15	chronologically created a privilege log trying
16	Q. Well, I arrived 75 minutes before the	16	to identify this single document that you
17	deposition and my understanding was that you	17	reviewed during your multi-hour six-lawyer
18	were in conference at that point?	18	preparation session yesterday.
19	MR. MEAGHER: Objection. It	19	I understand that it's a December of
20	assumes facts not in evidence.	20	2002 letter or correspondence between Valerie
21	A. That's not correct.	21	Loftin and Bob Bonzell. Have you been able to
22	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) How long were you in	22	locate that document?
23	conference today?	23	MR. MEAGHER: I object to the
$\frac{23}{24}$	A. Perhaps half an hour.	24	form.
25	Q. With whom were you in conference?	25	A. No, I did not.
123	Q. With whom were you in conference:	123	2 x. 1109 1 UIU 110 to

	Page 38		Page 40
1	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Am I correct it is a	1	A. The electronic documents or the hard
2	December 2002 memo or letter between those two	2	copy documents?
3	persons?	3	Q. Both.
4	A. To my recollection that is correct.	4	A. The hard copy documents were located in
5	Q. And how many pages is it?	5	a lateral file immediately adjacent to my
6	A. I believe it was on two pages.	6	office. And the electronic documents are on my
7	Q. Who was the author?	7	computer.
8	A. Valerie Loftin.	8	Q. A lateral file, you mean a
9	Q. She wrote a letter to Bob Bonzell?	9	A. I mean a storage cabinet that is wider
10	A. Correct.	10	than it is deep, if that makes sense to you.
11	Q. Bob Bonzell, a non-lawyer, president of	11	It's just a storage file cabinet that's wider
12	DMS, correct?	12	than a traditional one.
13	A. Correct.	13	Q. That's where you maintained these
14	Q. And what is Valerie Loftin's position?	14	Kearney paper documents that you received?
15	A. I'm not certain. I believe she's the	15	A. Yes.
16	head of claims for Jefferson-Pilot.	16	Q. I'm sorry, did I ask you this; was
17	Q. Was she giving Bonzell legal advice?	17	there anyone else that participated in the
18	A. I don't know. I don't recall.	18	production of documents at ERAC other than
19	Q. Did you read the letter yesterday?	19	yourself?
20	A. I only looked at one paragraph on it I	20	A. At ERAC no one else produced any
21	think is all I looked at.	21	documents or did anything of that nature.
22	Q. Was it your judgment that that	22	Q. That's because you would have been the
23	paragraph contained legal advice?	23	only one that would have had documents in your
24	A. No.	24	possession?
25	Q. So that that single paragraph of a	25	A. At ERAC, yes.
	Page 39		Page 41
1	single document is the only document you	1	Q. Why do you keep saying at ERAC? Are
2	reviewed during your several hour preparation	2	you referring to potentially documents that
3	session?	3	A. I understand that a document was
4	A. That's correct.	4	produced by someone else.
5	Q. Did you have a role in gathering	5	Q. Did you see that document?
6	documents for complying with the subpoena, sir?	6	A. I have seen that document, yes.
7	A. Yes.	7	Q. Was that document something that was in
8	Q. What was your role?	8	your files as well?
9	A. Identifying and making a CD to provide	9	A. I believe so.
10	to counsel.	10	Q. Do you know if that was produced to me
11	Q. So you mailed a CD to Mr. Baty with the	11	from you directly?
12	documents that you were able to collect?	12	A. I believe so. It was produced by me.
13	A. I believe a runner picked up the CD and	13	I believe it was in the materials that I had.
14	then I also produced the hard copy documents	14	Q. You're referring to the document that
15	that I had as well.	15	Attorney Zahnd provided to me, right?
16	Q. So the items that are on the CD would	16	A. I have an understanding of a document I
17	be e-mails and other electronically transmitted	17	believe Attorney Zahnd produced and that is the
18 19	communications?	18 19	document I'm referring to, which is just very
20	A. Correct. O. Anyone also at EPAC partake in the	20	short.
20 21	Q. Anyone else at ERAC partake in the production of documents pursuant to the	20	Q. I didn't come across this document in
$\frac{21}{22}$	subpoena?	22	the documents produced pursuant to the subpoena from ERAC that I received last week. But it's
23	A. Not to my knowledge.	23	your testimony you gave that document to your
24	Q. Where did you go to collect the	24	counsel to produce to me?
25	documents?	25	A. I believe I did, yes.
L	documento.		4 to 1 to the vert usus, yes.

	Page 42		Page 44
1	Q. Do you know why it was that this	1	is that your understanding?
2	document came to me through Mr. Zahnd?	2	A. I understand that is your assertion.
3	A. No.	3	Q. It's not my assertion, it's what the
4	Q. Did you see the letter from Mr. Zahnd?	4	letter asserts.
5	A. No.	5	A. I haven't had time to complete reading
6	Q. Does Mr. Newkirk still work with you?	6	the letter, but
7	A. No.	7	Q. Assume that I'm not misrepresenting
8	Q. He went with Swiss Re in that	8	A. Certainly.
9	transaction?	9	Q what the letter says, the attached
10	A. Correct.	10	document was in Newkirk's possession and he's
11	Q. Are you mindful that it's Mr. Newkirk	11	producing it. Do you know why it would be that
12	that produced that document to me, in addition	12	Newkirk would still have this document?
13	to your belief that you produced it to me?	13	A. I have no idea.
14	A. I have an understanding of what I	14	Q. Was this an electronically stored
15	believe was produced, but I have not seen	15	document?
16	Mr. Zahnd's letter or the document that he	16	A. I have no idea.
17	produced.	17	Q. Well, you say you produced it. Is it
18	(Dempsey Exhibits 1 & 2 were	18	something that you stored electronically?
19	marked for identification by the reporter.)	19	A. No.
20	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Exhibit 2, sir, is	20	Q. Are the numbers on here accurate?
21	the letter from Mr. Zahnd?	21	A. I have no idea.
22	MR. MEAGHER: Do you have a copy?	22	Q. Well, the document indicates, last page
23	If not, I will take a look at the witness'.	23	of Exhibit 2, "Chris Kearney," it says "he has
24	MR. ROBERTS: I have a copy for	24	two policies," gives the number and then it
25	you, sir.	25	identifies the ERC percentage.
	Page 43		Page 45
1	MR. MEAGHER: All right. Thank	1	A. Okay.
2	you.	2	Q. And under one policy it says ".2750,
3	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Have you seen this	3	lifetime," what does that mean?
4	letter from Mr. Zahnd before?	4	A. I'm not sure in what context Mr.
5	A. No.	-	
		5	Newkirk was putting this information down.
6	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a	6	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC
7	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would	6 7	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability,
7 8	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much.	6 7 8	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime?
7 8 9	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher	6 7 8 9	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states
7 8 9 10	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy	6 7 8 9 10	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime.
7 8 9 10 11	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a	6 7 8 9 10 11	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy?
7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the	6 7 8 9 10	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy?
7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you. MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure you're	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a disability policy would mean that there is a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you. MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure you're ready? You didn't take much time. MR. MEAGHER: Pretty quick reader.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a disability policy would mean that there is a lifetime benefit period.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you. MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure you're ready? You didn't take much time. MR. MEAGHER: Pretty quick reader. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Sir, according to	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a disability policy would mean that there is a lifetime benefit period. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The next says
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you. MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure you're ready? You didn't take much time. MR. MEAGHER: Pretty quick reader. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Sir, according to this letter from Mr. Zahnd dated May 4th, '07,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a disability policy would mean that there is a lifetime benefit period. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The next says "Benefit," and under the 029 policy it says
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you. MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure you're ready? You didn't take much time. MR. MEAGHER: Pretty quick reader. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Sir, according to this letter from Mr. Zahnd dated May 4th, '07, the document attached was a document that was in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a disability policy would mean that there is a lifetime benefit period. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The next says "Benefit," and under the 029 policy it says "67.1 percent," or actually it says .67.1
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MEAGHER: If I could take a look at it before the questions, I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now that Mr. Meagher has a copy MR. MEAGHER: If I could have a moment to read it. It's multi page. By the way, I don't think video was properly noticed and we object to the use of video at trial. It does require prior notice. Okay. I have reviewed it. Thank you. MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure you're ready? You didn't take much time. MR. MEAGHER: Pretty quick reader. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Sir, according to this letter from Mr. Zahnd dated May 4th, '07,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Newkirk was putting this information down. Q. Well, being familiar with the ERC business and policies and individual disability, does that mean that the benefits are lifetime? A. The document indicates it states twice lifetime. Q. Once for each policy? A. Well, it has the word "lifetime" under each policy number. Q. And you don't want to go out on a limb and speculate as to what lifetime might be in this context? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Well, lifetime in the context of a disability policy would mean that there is a lifetime benefit period. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The next says "Benefit," and under the 029 policy it says

	Page 46		Page 48
1	ERC has 67 percent of the responsibility and	1	A. No, I don't know.
2	under the other it's 100 percent?	2	Q. You're mindful in the documents that
3	A. Well, it's under the heading of	3	were produced to me last week there's everything
4	Benefit, so it doesn't necessarily logically	4	from the application filed back in 1990,
5	follow, but you could make that you could	5	documents all from 1990 through even last month,
6	make that guess I suppose.	6	right, May of 2007?
7	Q. It says "The Reserves .317,171 under	7	A. That's correct.
8	one policy and 184,536 under the other. Does	8	
9	that mean the total reserve on the policies as	9	Q. How is it that ERC came to possess those documents?
10	of whatever date this document was is a little	10	A. Which documents?
11	over 500,000?	11	
12	A. I have no idea.	12	Q. Well, the documents that predate 2000?
13	Q. Is this a form document at ERC, this	1	A. ERC has the right under the reinsurance
14	type of layout of information?	13 14	agreement to copies of all the documents. And I
15	**	15	can only speculate as to how they were produced
16	A. Not to my knowledge.	1	or who obtained them, but it would be pursuant
17	Q. Do you know why he would include the inviscious?	16	to that right under the reinsurance agreement.
18	jurisdiction? A. I have no idea.	17	Q. Do you know when that happened?
1		18	A. No. It predated my employment at ERC.
19	Q. That's a legal term that indicates	19	Q. So prior to your employment at ERC
20	where lawsuits can be brought, right?	20	there were documents regarding Kearney from the
21	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	21	'90 to '96 timeframe at ERC?
22	A. Mr. Newkirk is a lawyer, so I can only	22	A. Let me amend that somewhat. Prior to
23 24	assume he had those type of characteristics in	23	my involvement with the Jefferson-Pilot account
25	mind, not necessarily to litigate, but I	24	they were obtained. Exactly when, I don't know,
25	don't know. I would have to speculate as to why	25	but it was prior to my involvement.
	Page 47		Page 49
1	Mr. Newkirk put that on there.	1	Q. You came to be involved in '98?
2	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) That's what	2	A. Correct.
3	jurisdiction means, right, where lawsuits can be	3	Q. And when you came to be involved there
4	brought?	4	was materials regarding Mr. Kearney and ERC's
5	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	5	files that predated '98?
6	A. I think jurisdiction is somewhat of a	6	A. Correct.
7	generic term, but, yes, that would be my	7	Q. Do you know how big the file was then?
8	understanding, that's where a lawsuit could be	8	A. My recollection of the file at the time
9	brought. It can mean a variety of things,	9	I obtained it would be that it was probably less
10	subject matter, personal, etcetera.	10	than an inch thick.
11	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) These list of seven	11	Q. What materials were in there?
12	things kind of a To-Do list down at the bottom,	12	A. The materials I recall seeing in the
13	do you see that?	13	claim file were some claim forms and I really
14	A. I do.	14	don't recall anything specific above and beyond
15	Q. Do you know who was directing that to	15	just seeing continuance of disability forms in
16	To-Do List?	16	the file. Aside from that, I don't remember any
17	A. I'm not sure I understand what you mean	17	specific type or form of document.
18	by directing.	18	Q. You don't recall whether the policy was
19	Q. Do you know if Mr. Newkirk was creating	19	in there?
20	that to To-Do List and directing that others	20	A. No, I don't.
21	undertake those items?	21	Q. Now ERC possesses the application file.
22	A. No, I don't know that.	22	Do you know when it was that the application
23	Q. At the bottom it says "Copied for DMS."	23	file from 1990 was obtained by ERC?
24	Do you know if he actually copied this document	24	A. No, I don't.
25	and gave it to DMS?	25	Q. You've been the person at ERC or ERAC

1	Page 50		Page 52
1	responsible for this claim since '98, correct?	1	correspondence, deposition transcripts, medical
2	A. Correct.	2	records?
3	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	3	A. I'm sorry, was that a question?
4	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) And you don't know	4	Q. Yes.
5	when it would have been that the application	5	A. Would you repeat it, please.
6	file and all the other documents, the 3000 plus	6	Q. Is it the case that you receive
7	documents were received?	7	contemporaneously pleadings, correspondence,
8	A. As for the application file, I did not	8	deposition transcripts, medical records in the
9	request it, so it had to have been a portion of	9	litigation?
10	the file that I inherited. As for the other	10	A. I could receive any or all of those
11	3000 pages, as I stated earlier, I believe those	11	documents in any given case. That is correct.
12	are largely pursuant to the litigation.	12	Q. Why are you being copied on those
13	Q. Well, there is certainly litigation	13	materials?
14	documents in there. There's pleadings, motions,	14	A. You mean with respect to
15	correspondence, deposition transcripts. But the	15	Q. The litigation?
16	documents that predate the litigation, were	16	A. I'm being copied on it because of ERC's
17	those things that came to ERC contemporaneous	17	interest in the litigation and the fact that I'm
18	with their date or were they things that came	18	acting as an attorney for Employers Reassurance
19	after the litigation?	19	Corporation.
20	MR. BATY: Objection. Asked and	20	 Q. Are you making decisions in the
21	answered.	21	litigation?
22	MR. MEAGHER: I join.	22	A. I participate in discussions about
23	A. To my knowledge anything aside I	23	matters in the litigation. I have not made
24	won't say anything. The documents that you're	24	decisions per se.
25	referring to would had to have been compiled by	25	Q. You weigh-in, give them your thoughts
	Page 51		Page 53
1	anneans other then myself	1 .	
	someone other than mysen.	1	and opinions, comment about other peoples'
	someone other than myself. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation	2	and opinions, comment about other peoples' thoughts?
2 3	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents?	1	•
2	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation	2	thoughts?
2 3	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents?	2 3	thoughts? A. Certainly.
2 3 4	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents?A. The pre-1998 documents.	2 3 4	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more
2 3 4 5	 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by 	2 3 4 5	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot
2 3 4 5 6	 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents 	2 3 4 5 6	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 	2 3 4 5 6 7	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement, to my recollection and belief. I don't know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation? A. Certainly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement, to my recollection and belief. I don't know that I personally gathered documents. I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation? A. Certainly. Q. Isn't that the definition?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement, to my recollection and belief. I don't know that I personally gathered documents. I would have to look. If you have a specific document,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation? A. Certainly. Q. Isn't that the definition? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement, to my recollection and belief. I don't know that I personally gathered documents. I would have to look. If you have a specific document, I would have to look at it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation? A. Certainly. Q. Isn't that the definition? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I will certainly agree with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement, to my recollection and belief. I don't know that I personally gathered documents. I would have to look. If you have a specific document, I would have to look at it. Q. So during the course of the litigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation? A. Certainly. Q. Isn't that the definition? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I will certainly agree with that. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) There was a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) The pre-litigation documents? A. The pre-1998 documents. Q. Litigation was commenced by Jefferson-Pilot in June of 2002. The documents in the file that relate to the period '98 through 2002, are those things that came to you prior to litigation? A. I would have to look at the documents. I honestly don't know. Q. Do you recall how it is you came to possess the volume, the thousands of pages? A. Once again, I believe the thousands of pages are primarily attributable to the motions, pleadings, correspondence, etcetera, that you just laid out for us. The minority of the documents were compiled prior to my involvement, to my recollection and belief. I don't know that I personally gathered documents. I would have to look. If you have a specific document, I would have to look at it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thoughts? A. Certainly. Q. And apples being apples, ERC has more at stake in litigation than Jefferson-Pilot does, correct? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. ERC apparently has more than 50 percent of the reinsurance liability on this claim. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What does the term "work product" mean? Are you familiar with that? A. I'm familiar with that term. Q. Can you tell the jury what it means? A. That would be documents or it could encompass conversations that an attorney produces with respect to their client and with respect to litigation. Q. In anticipation of litigation? A. Certainly. Q. Isn't that the definition? MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. I will certainly agree with that.

	Page 54		Page 56
1	of that?	1	discussed the application file from 1990 on
2	A. Just from my brief review of your	2	Mr. Kearney is in there?
3	privilege log, I saw work product identified.	3	A. You indicated that earlier.
4	Q. You didn't partake in designating	4	Q. You don't know that?
5	documents as work product or attorney/client	5	A. I don't recall that.
6	privilege?	6	Q. Do you recall that the policy is in
7	A. No.	7	there?
8	Q. You just produced everything you had to	8	A. No, I don't recall that.
9	your counsel and from there they decided what	9	Q. Have you ever made an effort to look at
10	would be referred to as work product or	10	the policy?
11	attorney/client privilege?	11	A. I have looked at a specimen policy in
12	A. That is correct.	12	connection with Mr. Kearney's claim.
13	Q. Your counsel, Mr. Baty, is with you	13	Q. When did you do that?
14	today. Do you know if he participated in that	14	A. I have probably done that several
15	exercise with any other lawyers?	15	times.
16	MR. MEAGHER: I would object on	16	Q. Prior to the litigation?
17	work product grounds as to what procedures and	17	A. Yes.
18	methods were used to determine privilege claims.	18	Q. Prior to 2002?
19	MR. BATY: Join in the objection.	19	A. Yes.
20	MR. ROBERTS: Are you instructing	20	Q. Prior to 2001?
21	him not to answer?	21	A. Certainly in 2001. I don't know if
22	MR. BATY: Yes, I'm going to	22	there was anytime prior to 2001, I don't recall,
23	instruct him not to answer. The only reason	23	but I know I did in 2001.
24	that he would know that or understand that would	24	Q. Do you know there's medical records in
25	be in discussion with me, so I'm going to	25	there, in the ERC file?
	Page 55		Page 57
1	instruct you not to answer the question.	1	A. I don't recall that.
2	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) You know, sir, that	2	Q. You don't recall there is medical
3	when a lawyer claims work product it's because a	3	records in there?
4	document comments on or is in anticipation of	4	A. No, I don't.
5	litigation, right?	5	Q. There's information in there about
6	A. Correct.	6	Mr. Kearney's other lawsuits with third parties.
7	MR. ROBERTS: Can we have a	7	Are you mindful of that?
8	stipulation that all of the documents produced	8	A. I recall information about
9	to me are authentic?	9	Mr. Kearney's other lawsuits. I don't recall it
10	MR. BATY: Yes. You and I had	10	was in that file, but I do recall that that
11	that discussion earlier in connection with the	11	information has arisen in the course of the
12	subpoena that you issued to the corporation	12	adjudication of his claim.
13	Employers Reassurance. And I told you at the	13	Q. Are you mindful there is information in
14	time that Mr. Dempsey was the witness who could	14	there about his relationship with his wife?
15	testify to that. And rather than go through the	15	A. I recall there being some information
16	documents that were actually produced to you, we	16	about his wife of fairly recent note, but I
17	will stipulate as to the authenticity of the	17	don't recall anything specific beyond that.
18	documents.	18	Q. You're mindful that there is
19	MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Meagher, you're	19	surveillance information in there including
20	shaking your head up and down. Are you	20	photographs?
21	MR. MEAGHER: I have no reason to	21	A. I have seen a photograph that I believe
22	disagree. If the producing party says they are	22	was produced by you.
23	authentic, I have no reason to object to that.	23	Q. Well, the privilege log makes reference
24	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Now, as that file	24	to several photographs that have been withheld
25	produced to me exist, there's, I think we	25	from me. Are those things that are maintained

1 2	Page 58		Page 60
2	in your file?	1	A. I express my opinions to the people
	A. I don't recall.	2	that are involved in adjudicating the claim as
3	Q. There is IME reports on Mr. Kearney in	3	well as litigating the claim.
4	your ERC or ERAC file, are you mindful of that?	4	Q. Do you do that in all matters of your
5	A. I do recall an IME report.	5	insured, your clients insureds, that go to
6	Q. Pleadings including drafts of pleadings	6	litigation?
7	that weren't filed, are you mindful of that?	7	A. Not all, but probably the majority of
8	A. I recall pleadings. I don't recall	8	all claims that go to litigation have a high
9	drafts, but I do recall pleading.	9	level of involvement by someone with Employers
10	Q. It's been the case over the past	10	Reassurance Corporation.
11	several years that drafts of pleadings or	11	Q. Because of the percentage of the
12	motions or memoranda would be shared with you	12	liability you carry?
13	before filing, correct?	13	A. No. Simply because it's in litigation
14	A. That's correct.	14	and it's something that we would be interested
15	Q. Drafts of correspondence to	15	in, but it's not a routine that's engaged in
16	Mr. Kearney's counsel has been shared with you	16	every claim.
17	before they have been issued, correct?	17	Q. Did you review the privilege log before
18	A. On some occasions.	18	it was issued to me?
19	Q. Deposition transcripts have been	19	A. No.
20	provided to you for your review, right?	20	Q. Could you take a look at it now for me.
21	A. I have seen at least two or three	21	A. Certainly.
22	deposition transcripts.	22	MR. MEAGHER: Do you have another
23	Q. Hearing transcripts, right?	23	copy?
24	A. Hearing transcripts, yes, I believe	24	A. Is there something in particular you
25	there have been a couple hearing transcripts.	25	want me to look at or just to flip through?
23	Page 59		Page 61
	Lugo U	1	9
1 1	O That are in your file?	1	O We are going to go through several
1	Q. That are in your file?	1	Q. We are going to go through several
2	A. That were electronic documents I	2	entries on there.
2 3	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical	2 3	entries on there. A. Okay.
2 3 4	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file.	2 3 4	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to
2 3 4 5	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your	2 3 4 5	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a
2 3 4 5 6	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file?	2 3 4 5 6	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not	2 3 4 5 6 7	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you? A. No, I'm not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you know who Arthur Huy, H-u-y?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you? A. No, I'm not. Q. So why do you have all that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you know who Arthur Huy, H-u-y? A. No, I do not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you? A. No, I'm not. Q. So why do you have all that information?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you know who Arthur Huy, H-u-y? A. No, I do not. Q. J.L. Roberson?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you? A. No, I'm not. Q. So why do you have all that information? A. It helps me to analyze the claim.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you know who Arthur Huy, H-u-y? A. No, I do not. Q. J.L. Roberson? A. I am familiar with the name.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you? A. No, I'm not. Q. So why do you have all that information? A. It helps me to analyze the claim. Q. And then you express your opinion to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you know who Arthur Huy, H-u-y? A. No, I do not. Q. J.L. Roberson? A. I am familiar with the name. Q. Did you hire Geraldine Johnson?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. That were electronic documents I maintained as opposed to being in a physical file. Q. Electronic and physical are in your file? A. I'm trying to explain, not differentiate. Q. Mr. Kearney's tax returns are in your file, business and personal? A. I recall seeing or I recall there being tax information in the file. Q. Information regarding audits of Mr. Kearney's financial condition is in your file? A. I don't recall that. Q. Why do you have all that information? You're not adjudicating the claim, are you? A. No, I'm not. Q. So why do you have all that information? A. It helps me to analyze the claim.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	entries on there. A. Okay. MR. MEAGHER: If we're going to go through several entries, why don't we have a copy made of that. MR. BATY: Sure. MR. ROBERTS: Let's go off the video record and off the record. MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:40. We are going off the record. (Off the record) (Dempsey Exhibit 3 through 24 was marked for identification porter.) MR. MARTIN: The time is now 1:49. We're back on the record. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, do you know who Arthur Huy, H-u-y? A. No, I do not. Q. J.L. Roberson? A. I am familiar with the name. Q. Did you hire Geraldine Johnson? A. I spoke with Geraldine Johnson about

	Page 62		Page 64
1	discussions with her.	1	Q. I asked you a negative question and you
2	Q. Is Geraldine Johnson a lawyer that ERC	2	gave me a negative response.
3	had used prior to Mr. Kearney?	3	A. I do not recall ever speaking with
4	A. No.	4	Mr. Hughes about Chris Kearney's claim.
5	Q. So your testimony under oath is that	5	Q. Thank you. Who is Lisa Pluto?
6	you're not the person and ERC wasn't the entity	6	A. I have no idea.
7	that directed she be retained to file a lawsuit	7	Q. Who is Pat Beardshaw?
8	against Mr. Kearney?	8	A. I don't know.
9	A. I believe my recollection is that I	9	Q. Diane Goodman?
10	spoke with Ms. Johnson about Mr. Kearney's	10	A. I don't know.
11	claim.	11	Q. Sandie Cook?
12	Q. Did you participate in the decision to	12	A. I don't know.
13	retain her to file a lawsuit against	13	Q. John Cohill?
14	Mr. Kearney? Don't tell me what you told her or	14	A. I don't know.
15	what she said. I just want to know if you	15	Q. Cynthia Croft?
16	participated in the decision to retain her?	16	A. Cynthia Croft is the head of claims at
17	A. I believe I indicated to	17	the Lincoln Financial office in Concord, New
18	Jefferson-Pilot that we had spoken with	18	Hampshire.
19	Geraldine Johnson and that she had reviewed the	19	Q. Michelle Allen?
20	contract, the policy.	20	A. I don't know I take that back.
21	MR. BATY: His question was did	21	Michelle Allen I believe is an employee of DMS.
22	you participate.	22	Q. Do you know what her role is?
23	A. I don't recall. I don't recall whether	23	A. No.
24	that occurred or not. I just don't recall the	24	Q. Is she in a support role or does she
25	exact mechanics of how that occurred.	25	have some claims responsibility?
************	Page 63		Page 65
1	Q. Whose Jane Neidermyer?	1	A. I don't know. I recognize her name as
2	A. Jane Neidermyer is an employee of now	2	an employee of DMS.
3	Lincoln Financial formally Jefferson-Pilot.	3	Q. Do you know who Dave Foster is?
4	Q. You had interactions with her regarding	4	A. No, I do not.
5	this claim?	5	Q. John Zervas?
6	A. I don't recall that I did.	6	A. I do not know John.
7	Q. Do you know what her role was at	7	Q. A lawyer. Z-e-r-v-a-s.
8	Jefferson-Pilot?	8	A. I do not know John to my knowledge. I
9	A. She was the she was in charge of the	9	don't recall the name.
10	claims area at Jefferson-Pilot at that time.	10	Q. Shared some correspondence with him
11	Q. Was she a lawyer as far as you know?	11	according to the privilege log in January of
12	A. Not to my knowledge.	12	'04? It doesn't ring a bell?
13	Q. Do you know who Lori Gallien is?	13	A. No, it doesn't.
14	G-a-l-l-i-e-n.	14	Q. Linda Bey, B-e-y?
15	A. The name is vaguely familiar, but I	15	A. I believe Ms. Bey is a legal assistant
16	don't recall in what context.	16	or paralegal at Disability Management Services.
17	Q. Neidermyer is N-e-i-d-e-r-m-y-e-r. Who	17	Q. How many lawyers have been involved in
18	is Karen Gaum, G-a-u-m?	18	prosecuting this claim against Mr. Kearney?
19	A. I have no idea.	19	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
20	Q. Have you spoken with Bill Hughes about	20	A. I believe Geraldine Johnson until the
21	this matter?	21	time of her death and Mr. Ellis and Mr. Meagher.
22	A. Not that I recall.	22	Q. The privilege log shows a whole bunch
1 44		22	
23	Q. You cannot recall ever speaking to	23	of other lawyers Peter Burrell, Randy McGaff,
i	Q. You cannot recall ever speaking to Mr. Hughes about Chris Kearney?	23 24	Amy Gasser Callow, Adam Formus, Stephanie

	Page 66		Page 68
1	Schmidt?	1	members of.
2	A. Well, I misinterpreted your sense of	2	Q. Peter Burrell?
3	the word "prosecuting this". And so, yes, there	3	A. I believe Peter Burrell may be in that
4	have been other lawyers involved such as those	4	same law firm.
5	you just identified.	5	Q. Carl Semmler, S-e-m-m-l-e-r?
6	Q. You personally have interacted with	6	A. Mr. Semmler is an attorney employed by
7	more than ten during the course of this	7	Lincoln Financial, a staff attorney, in-house
8	litigation, right?	8	counsel.
9	A. I don't know that for a fact.	9	Q. Mark Davenport?
10	MR. ROBERTS: I guess we will	10	A. Mark Davenport I believe was an actuary
11	stipulate that the privilege log is authentic as	11	employed at Jefferson-Pilot at that time.
12	well, Exhibit 1, and an accurate representation	12	Q. Bill
13	of the documents referred to?	13	A. I'm sorry, I'm misspeaking. I believe
14	MR. BATY: Right. He didn't see	14	Mark Davenport is an attorney in Dallas, Texas.
15	it, but it was produced by counsel.	15	Q. He apparently was involved in the
16	MR. ROBERTS: Can we have that	16	Kearney claim at Document 1916 in February of
17	stipulation?	17	'06. Does that ring a bell?
18	MR. BATY: Yes.	18	A. No, it doesn't.
19	MR. MEAGHER: The privilege logs	19	Q. How about Bill Davenport?
20	aren't evidence, so authenticity is not	20	A. I don't know a Bill Davenport.
21	appropriate, but it is what it is.	21	Q. Steve Rice?
22	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Does ERC have	22	A. Steve Rice is a CPA employed by DMS.
23	responsibility for the legal expenses in the	23	Q. Andy Cohen?
24	lawsuit filed by Jefferson-Pilot against	24	A. Andy Cohen is counsel for DMS.
25	Mr. Kearney?	25	Q. Adam Formus?
	Page 67		Page 69
1	A. ERC shares a percentage of the legal	1	A. Adam Formus is counsel for DMS.
2	expenses.	2	Q. Stephanie Farabow?
3	Q. Commensurate with its liability on the	3	A. Stephanie Farabow is in-house counsel
4	claim?	4	for Jefferson-Pilot now Lincoln Financial.
5	A. Correct.	5	Q. Carrie Barnes?
6	Q. Who is Rick Strange or Stange,	6	A. I believe Ms. Barnes is a DMS employee.
7	S-t-a-n-g-e?	7	I believe she's an attorney for DMS.
8	A. I believe Mr. Stange is the head of	8	Q. George Walker?
9	litigation for Jefferson-Pilot. I don't know if	9	A. I don't know.
10	his role has changed since they were acquired by	10	Q. Diane Goodman? Did I mention her
11	Lincoln.	11	before?
12	Q. Lincoln Financial?	12	A. The name is familiar. I believe
13	A. Correct.	13	Ms. Goodman may be a DMS employee, but I can't
14	Q. Who is Patricia Perez?	14	state that with absolute certainty.
15	A. Ms. Perez is my assistants.	15	Q. Andrew Lynn?
16	Q. Who is Kristin Knoll, K-n-o-l-l?	16	A. I believe Mr. Lynn is an attorney at
17	A. I don't know.	17	DMS.
18	Q. An e-mail to me in the privilege log.	18	Q. Norman Carrier?
19	I won't tell anybody. Scott Lancaster?	19	A. Mr. Carrier is a claim examiner
20	A. I don't know Scott to my recollection.	20	employed by Jefferson-Pilot now Lincoln
21	Q. Darlene Stanczak, S-t-a-n-c-z-a-k?	21	Financial in their Concord, New Hampshire
22	A. I don't know.	22	office.
23	Q. C.J. Schmidt?	23	Q. What do you understand the status of Mr. Kearney's non-litigation claim to be?
24	A. I believe Mr. Schmidt is an attorney in	24	
25	the law firm that Mr. Ellis and Ms. Callow are	25	A. I believe he's being paid. Would it be

	Page 70)	Page 72
1	possible to take a break in a minute or two?	1	A. Yes.
2	Q. That would be perfect. Did I ask you	2	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) If you turn to 401.
3	who Andy Cohen is?	3	A. Okay.
4	A. You did.	4	Q. That's a document from February of '95
5	Q. Who is Maria Martinez?	5	from some unknown person to some unknown person
6	A. I don't know.	6	that's being withheld for what reason?
7	O. Scott West?	7	A. The privilege claimed is work product.
8	A. Scott West is in-house counsel for	8	Q. In February of '95, correct?
9	ERAC.	9	A. Correct.
10	Q. Is he someone that reports to you?	10	Q. If you turn to 718.
11	A. No.	11	A. Okay.
12	Q. Is he your peer?	12	Q. That's a document from the next month
13	A. Essentially.	13	March of '95 from an unknown author to an
14	Q. Did he recently become involved in the	14	unknown recipient also being withheld for what
15	claim?	15	reason is claimed?
16	A. He's only been employed	16	A. Document 718 I'm sorry.
17	Q. Or litigation?	17	Q. Yes.
18	A by ERAC for a couple of years, so	18	A. Yes. It's being withheld on the basis
19	that would be true.	19	of work product.
20	Q. Now would be a good time for a break?	20	Q. If you turn to 1466 for me?
21	A. Thank you.	21	A. Okay.
22	MR. MARTIN: The time is now	22	Q. That document is dated November 14th of
23	2:11. We're going off the record.	23	1996, correct?
24	(Recess)	24	A. According to the privilege log, yes,
25	MR. MARTIN: The time is now	25	that's correct.
	Page 71		Page 73
1	2:15. We're back on the record.	1	Q. By your predecessor with responsibility
2	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Mr. Dempsey, let's	2	for the claim here at ERC?
3	focus a little bit on the privilege log. Your	3	A. Mr. Newkirk, that's correct.
4	mindful of how this is laid out. There's	4	Q. Who was your predecessor responsible
5	several columns and it's the references are	5	for the Jefferson-Pilot block of business at
6	here numerically based on how documents were	6	ERC?
7	numbered, do you understand that?	7	A. That is correct.
8	A. Under the Beginning Document column?	8	Q. His responsibility was in the November
9	Q. Yes.	9	'96 timeframe, right?
10	A. Yes.	10	A. That was his responsibility at that
11	Q. So if I ask you to turn to the	11	time.
12	reference to Document No. 789, could you do	12	Q. You were a new-be at ERC at that time?
13	that?	13	A. That is correct.
14	A. Yes.	14	Q. And the subject of that particular
15	Q. Take a look at 789, 804, 800, 801, all	15	document being withheld is what? What's the
16	of those documents are dated February '94 and	16	subject of that document?
17	have been withheld under the claim of work	17	A. It says it's a recommendation.
18	product privilege, right?	18	Q. And it's being held on the basis of
19	A. That is what this document indicates,	19	what?
20	yes.	20	A. Work product.
21	Q. Meaning that the company was	21	Q. And it's a transmittal from ERC to
22	anticipating litigation against Mr. Kearney back	22	Mr. Roberson at Jefferson-Pilot, is that your
23	in February of 1994 would be your conclusion,	23	understanding?
24	right?	24	A. It's a transmittal from Mr. Newkirk at
25	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	25	ERC to Mr. Roberson at Jefferson-Pilot.

Page 20 of 58

Mr. Kearney, right?

25

five you just mentioned?

25

	Page 78		Page 80
1	A. That's what the privilege log	1	A. That is correct.
2	indicates.	2	Q. So what directs what compels Bill
3	Q. And the recipient is David Newkirk?	3	Dempsey to send a file to DMS?
4	A. Again that's what the log indicates.	4	A. When a company is overwhelmed by the
5	Q. So more than four years prior to	5	claims volume or when a company needs additional
6	actually filing a lawsuit against Mr. Kearney,	6	resources to investigate a claim.
7	Mr. Ellis was involved in discussing claims	7	Q. Then you turn to DMS?
8	handling with ERC on Mr. Kearney's claim?	8	A. Not in every case. Sometimes I
9	A. I don't know.	9	interact with the company.
10	Q. That's what one would conclude from	10	Q. What directs you to engage DMS?
11	this reference, right?	11	A. I would engage DMS. At this point we
12	MR. MEAGHER: Object to form.	12	have DMS involved in blocks that they manage. I
13	A. You can conclude that.	13	don't engage them on any other basis at this
14	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Is that a logical	14	point. I discuss certain cases that pertain to
15	conclusion?	15	blocks that they manage.
16	MR. MEAGHER: Same objection.	16	Q. So you haven't made a referral to DMS
17	A. You can conclude that from the fact	17	under the consulting agreement for sometime?
18	that it's on the privilege log.	18	A. No. Not for quite sometime, no, I have
19	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Do you conclude that?	19	not done that.
20	A. Without examining the document I can't	20	Q. The consulting agreement is still in
21	tell you, but I would conclude that by virtue of	21	place?
22	the fact it's on the privilege log.	22	A. I don't believe it is.
23	Q. How many files did you personally refer	23	Q. When it was in place, was it a rare
24	to DMS under the consulting agreement?	24	occurrence for you to direct a claim file to
25	A. Under the consulting agreement I don't	25	DMS, or was it a common occurrence? I'm
	Page 79		Page 81
1	know. I honestly don't know.	1	referring to DMS under the consulting agreement.
2	Q. Are we talking hundreds?	2	A. It would be rare.
3	A. No.	3	Q. Sir, I think we're coming near the end
4	Q. Talking dozens?	4	here. I have marked several documents as
5	A. No.	5	Exhibits 3 through 24.
6	Q. I'm talking about just not	6	A. Would you like me to return the
7	Jefferson-Pilot, all of the clients?	7	privilege log to the reporter?
8 9	A. Under the consulting agreement period,	8	Q. That would be great. I have marked as
10	I really don't know. There certainly have not been hundreds.	9 10	Exhibit 3, it has a Bates number at the bottom WDDP 000317?
11	Q. What drives you to use their services?	11	A. Correct.
12	A. DMS provides good customer service and	12	
13	they	13	Q. Second page is the full number is not there. It's 33. And then the copier cut it
14	Q. To whom?	14	off. The third page is 342, do you see that?
15	A. To everyone involved.	15	A. Yes, I do.
16	Q. The policyholder?	16	Q. You're mindful that Bates number refers
17	A. The policyholder.	17	to documents produced to me that were maintained
18	Q. What makes you conclude that?	18	in your storage cabinet?
19	A. Just based on my understanding of how	19	A. Yes.
20	they conduct their business operations.	20	Q. And you understand these to be the
21	Q. They provide you good customer service?	21	applications, some of the applications, filed
22	A. ERC is satisfied with the service they	22	documents dating back to 1990 on Mr. Kearney?
23	provide.	23	A. I see there is a notation on
24	Q. DMS has been a vendor for more than a	24	Document 317 that says "App file". And based on
25	decade?	25	the title of Document 338, I would assume that

	Page 82		Page 84
1	this was a report that was gathered in	1	A. Correct.
2	conjunction with the application for insurance.	2	Q. And it says "We've received and
3	And I suspect Document 342 was in conjunction	3	processed the report submitted to the period
4	with Document 338.	4	January through March of '95 regarding Chris
5	Q. These are documents from your file,	5	Kearney." And policy number. "Your report
6	right?	6	indicates 100 percent of benefit amount ceded to
7	A. By virtue of the fact that they were	7	ERC. Just need for you to confirm this is the
8	produced, yes.	8	correct percentage. Also, please submit a
9	Q. Exhibit 2, letter dated September 8,	9	current medical and/or investigative report for
1	1993.	10	this claimant."
10	A. Just one second, Mr. Roberts. I don't	11	Are the facts represented in this
1	know that I have Exhibit 2. I go from three to	12	letter accurate as far as you know?
12		13	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
13	four.	14	A. I don't know.
14	Q. Four. Letter dated September 8, '93.	15	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) You don't know if
15	A. Yes. Document 813.	16	there's been 100 of the benefit amount ceded
16	Q. Exactly.	17	A. No.
17	A. Yes, I have that.	18	Q c-e-d-e-d to ERC?
18	Q. I think the handwriting on this document is Roberson, but whether it is or it	19	A. I apologize for interrupting. No, I do
19		20	not know that.
20	isn't, does the handwriting on this document	ŧ	Q. Do you know that not to be the case?
21	make sense to you?	21	
22	A. No, not in this context it doesn't.	22	A. No, I don't know it not to be the case
23	Q. It seems to say, it appears "May should	23	either. It appears that it was an issue here
24	be at the rate of 63 percent, June at 50	24	too.
25	percent, July 100 percent." Those numbers don't	25	Q. This too has not been produced
	Page 83		Page 85
1	mean anything to you?	1	previously in this litigation even though it was
2	A. They have no significance to me.	2	purportedly sent to Jefferson-Pilot. Do you
3	Q. Then Exhibit 5, is that 792, Document	3	know why that would be?
4	792?	4	MR. MEAGHER: Object to form.
5	A. Correct.	5	A. I do not know.
6	Q. This came from your file. Do you hold	6	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Next Exhibit 7. This
7	any significance to these notes on this	7	appears to be Mr. Shelton's response to ERC,
8	particular exhibit?	8	right?
9	A. It appears to be a document where	9	A. Correct.
10	someone was inquiring with regard to residual	10	Q. And he expounds on it and references a
11	disability, onset of residual disability. I	11	second policy, do you see that?
12	can't read all the rest of it.	12	A. Yes.
13	Q. This is not a document that has been	13	Q. And Mr. Shelton provides
14	produced previously in the litigation. I was	14	contemporaneously the recent disability claim
15	wondering is this a document that ERC created or	15	report for ERC, right?
16	is this a document you received from	16	A. He indicates that's enclosed with this
17	Jefferson-Pilot?	17	information, yes.
18	A. ERC, to the best of my knowledge, did	18	Q. Do you happen to know that was the
19	not create this document.	19	course of business that ERC would
20	Q. Do you see it's dated November of '94?	20	contemporaneously receive those type of forms on
21	A. I do.	21	Mr. Kearney?
22	Q. Exhibit 6, document labeled 398 appears	22	A. No, I do not.
23	to be a April 1, '95 letter from Employers	23	Q. You don't know one way or the other?
24	Reinsurance Corporation to Jefferson-Pilot,	24	A. No.
25	right?	25	Q. Is that the case in '98 through 2002?

Page 86 Page 88 1 A. I don't believe it was the case. 1 Q. And at that meeting, I wasn't there, I 2 Q. Did you ever receive any continuance of 2 also have been told that there was a settlement 3 disability information involving Mr. Kearney 3 proposal or some kind of offer made to 4 during that period? 4 Mr. Kearney's lawyer. Is that your 5 A. It's possible. I can't tell you one 5 understanding also? 6 way or the other. 6 A. That's correct. 7 Q. Document 010, 011, 012 is Exhibit 8. 7 Q. And the offer was contingent on 8 Do you know whose handwriting this is? 8 Mr. Kearney turning in his policies, right? 9 A. I believe this is John Anderson's 9 A. I don't recall. 10 handwriting. 10 Q. Were you consulted prior to the Q. So at the top where it says "Res equals individuals who made that offer to Mr. Kearney's 11 11 12 501,707," is that the ERC reserve or is that the 12 lawyer? 13 JP reserve? A. I believe I was. 13 Q. And did you participate somehow in the 14 A. I do not know. 14 15 Q. Look back at Exhibit 2. authority that they were given to make the offer 15 in the stated amount, whatever that amount was? 16 A. I don't believe I have an Exhibit 2. 16 17 Q. Okay. The document that Mr. Newkirk 17 A. Can you restate that? provided, do you know who authored that 18 18 Q. Can you authorize those individuals to document, ERC or somebody else? 19 19 state a certain offer? 20 A. I believe Mr. Newkirk authored that 20 A. I don't --21 document. 21 MR. BATY: I'm going to object to 22 Q. When he states the reserve there, is he 22 attorney/client privilege in terms of what he referring to the ERC reserve exclusive of any JP 23 23 did. I think your first question was did he 24 reserve? 24 participate and that I was going to allow him to 25 A. I don't know. 25 answer. Page 87 Page 89 1 MR. MEAGHER: Objection. Asked 1 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Why don't we return to my first question if that's the one that 2 and answered. 2 3 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What's the total 3 you're allowed to answer. Did you participate reserve he reflects on Exhibit 2? 4 in authorizing those individuals to make the 4 5 MR. MEAGHER: Objection. Form. 5 stated offer? Are you looking for guidance? A. Approximately 501,000 and some change. 6 6 A. I'm waiting to see if there's is an Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Thank you. Do you 7 7 objection because I don't think that was your recall in the whole history of this claim of 8 8 prior question. 9 Mr. Kearney that there was an October 2001 Cuban 9 Q. Can we read back the prior question? coffee house meeting? 10 10 (Whereupon, the previous question 11 MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. from page 88, line 15 was read back by the 11 12 A. I am not certain what you're alluding 12 reporter.) 13 to there. I can speculate, but I'm not going to 13 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) What do you 14 do that. understand the question to have been? 14 MR. BATY: The first question she 15 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) You were instructed 15 16 yesterday over the course of five hours not to read, did you participate. 16 17 speculate, so don't do that. 17 (Whereupon, the previous question MR. MEAGHER: I'm going to 18 18 from page 88, line 15 was read back by the 19 object. It's attorney/client privilege as to 19 reporter.) 20 any discussions. 20 MR. BATY: Answer that question. 21 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) In October of 2001, 21 A. I believe so. 22 there was a meeting in Miami, Florida. You're 22 Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Who else mindful that that event was reported to you 23 23 participated? 24 subsequent, right? 24 A. I don't recall. A. Yes. 25 Q. Was Jefferson-Pilot represented during 25

	Page 90		Page 92
1	that process?	1	Q. So is there an actual exercise to
2	A. I don't recall.	2	adjust reserves to individual claims at ERC?
3	Q. Do you recall who you communicated	3	A. As I stated earlier, the reserves are
4	with?	4	what they are. What an actuary does with them I
5	A. I think I know who I did, but I don't	5	can't tell you.
6	know with absolute certainty.	6	Q. How about 9. Nine is a July 8th, 1997
7	Q. Do you think it was Bill Hughes?	7	letter from Mr. Shelton to DMS that comes from
8	A. No.	8	your file and is numbered 050.
9	Q. Bob Mills?	9	MR. MEAGHER: Counsel, before you
10	A. I believe it was Bob Mills.	10	proceed, I note inadvertently there is other
11	Q. You don't recall any other	11	insureds names identified in the Re and those
12	participants?	12	should be redacted before it's attached to the
13	A. No.	13	deposition.
14	Q. You don't recall any other	14	MR. ROBERTS: I don't know that I
15	participants, correct?	15	agree with that, but let's proceed.
16	A. No, I do not recall any other	16	MR. MEAGHER: Then I would
17	participants.	17	designate this as confidential under the order.
18	O. Is this Exhibit 8 a form that you, ERC	18	MR. ROBERTS: The entire
19	gets from DMS on claims that are referred to	19	transcript?
20	DMS?	20	MR. MEAGHER: Not yet.
21	A. I believe ERC got certain claim	21	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) This says " Dear
22	analysis reported on this form, yes.	22	John, Enclosed is the material from the files in
23	Q. Not just on Mr. Kearney's claim, but	23	the above three insureds, Mr. Kahn, Mr. Kearney
24	other claims?	24	and Mr. London. These are the cases that you're
25	A. I believe so.	25	going to investigate for us to see what can be
	Page 91		Page 93
1			
	O Is this an ERC created form or is this	1	done either to settle these in an equitable
	Q. Is this an ERC created form or is this a DMS created form?	1 2	done either to settle these in an equitable manner to both the reinsurer and to
2	a DMS created form?	2	manner to both the reinsurer and to
2 3	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS	2 3	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on
2 3 4	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form.	2 3 4	manner to both the reinsurer and to
2 3 4 5	 a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that 	2 3 4 5	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6	 a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was 	2 3 4	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right?
2 3 4 5 6 7	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44,	2 3 4 5 6	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that
2 3 4 5 6	 a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was 	2 3 4 5 6 7	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static at the time the claim is filed or once it's established? A. A reserve changes over time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that is important.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static at the time the claim is filed or once it's established?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that is important. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Do you know why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static at the time the claim is filed or once it's established? A. A reserve changes over time. Q. On a group basis or an individual claim basis?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that is important. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Do you know why that's not stated here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static at the time the claim is filed or once it's established? A. A reserve changes over time. Q. On a group basis or an individual claim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that is important. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Do you know why that's not stated here? MR. BATY: Objection. Same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static at the time the claim is filed or once it's established? A. A reserve changes over time. Q. On a group basis or an individual claim basis?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that is important. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Do you know why that's not stated here? MR. BATY: Objection. Same objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a DMS created form? A. This is, to my knowledge, this is a DMS created form. Q. This document indicates that Mr. Kearney was born in 1952 and the review was done in '97, so he would have been 45, 44, assume for me my math is correct? A. I will make that assumption, yes. Q. The reserve 501,000, would it grow or decrease as Mr. Kearney gets older? A. Ultimately it will decrease. Q. But he was 44 at that time. Would it increase when he's 45, 46, 47, 48? A. I don't know. Q. Does it adjust or does it remain static at the time the claim is filed or once it's established? A. A reserve changes over time. Q. On a group basis or an individual claim basis? A. On an individual claim basis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	manner to both the reinsurer and to Jefferson-Pilot, or to give us further advice on where to proceed," right? A. That is correct. Q. Are these three files files that Newkirk directed JP to send to DMS under the consulting agreement? A. I don't know. Q. Do you think it would be important for the task to be to see what could be done to settle these in an equitable manner on behalf of the insured instead of just the reinsurer and Jefferson-Pilot? MR. BATY: Objection. Argumentative. MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form. A. Can I answer? Yes, I would think that is important. Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Do you know why that's not stated here? MR. BATY: Objection. Same

1	Page 94		Page 96
1 2	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Next is ten and this	1	A. As far as I know, no.
2	appears to be DMS's status report on those three	2	Q. Exhibit 12 is a similar letter dated a
3	referrals with some information redacted and	3	week later, June 26th, '98. Do you know whose
4	some information about Mr. Kearney, right?	4	handwriting that is "Okay to pay our percentage
5	A. Yes.	5	to JP?"
6	Q. Do you know if this information was in	6	A. I believe it's Mr. Newkirk's writing.
7	the ERC claim file when you took responsibility	7	Q. Was it the procedure that you or he had
8	for the Jefferson-Pilot block of business?	8	to authorize payments on the Kearney claim?
9	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	9	A. For issues that are sent to us for
10	A. No, I don't know.	10	reimbursement, yes, we would have to authorize
11	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Next is a June 1998	11	the payment.
12	letter, which is Exhibit 11, right?	12	Q. By reimbursement you're excluding
13	A. That is correct.	13	actual claim dollars paid? You're just talking
14	Q. This is from Shelton to Newkirk in June	14	about the surveillance, medical records, legal
15	of '98. Had you at that point taken	15	expenses, that kind of thing?
16	responsibility for the claim or not?	16	A. For expenses certainly. For those
17	A. I don't know.	17	types of expenses we would authorize the
18	Q. Well, if you look at 001 of the	18	reimbursement, yes.
19	privilege log, this is after you write a five	19	Q. What about payment of the claim?
20	page letter to Shelton regarding additional	20	A. Payment of the claim, you know, it's
21	claim file review, 001 to 005, right?	21	we are billed periodically from Jefferson-Pilot
22	A. Correct.	22	for their payments.
23	Q. And what this letter reflects is just	23	Q. How do you satisfy yourself that the
24	the sharing of certain expenses relating to	24	payments are appropriate?
25	Mr. Kearney's policy, sharing of information	25	A. That Jefferson-Pilot's payments are
		i	
	Page 95		Page 97
1	Page 95 about expenses?	1	Page 97 appropriate? I believe we take a ceding
2	_	1 2	
	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make	ŧ	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding
2 3 4	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you?	2	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you
2 3 4 5	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes.	2 3	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review.
2 3 4 5 6	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued	2 3 4 5 6	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was	2 3 4 5 6 7	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have 80 percent of the responsibility?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file? A. I see that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have 80 percent of the responsibility? A. I don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file? A. I see that. Q. From a case filed in 1997. Do you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have 80 percent of the responsibility? A. I don't know. Q. Is it something that is presently in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file? A. I see that. Q. From a case filed in 1997. Do you know why that's in your claim file?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have 80 percent of the responsibility? A. I don't know. Q. Is it something that is presently in dispute between you and Jefferson-Pilot?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file? A. I see that. Q. From a case filed in 1997. Do you know why that's in your claim file? A. I'm not certain.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have 80 percent of the responsibility? A. I don't know. Q. Is it something that is presently in dispute between you and Jefferson-Pilot? A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file? A. I see that. Q. From a case filed in 1997. Do you know why that's in your claim file? A. I'm not certain. Q. Sixteen is a document that's Bates 191.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about expenses? A. That's what it appears to be, yes. Q. Does the calculation at the bottom make sense to you? A. Yes. Q. Does this mean that there was issued \$3500 of benefits and 2800 of the 3500 was something ceded to ERC? A. That is what the document indicates. Q. And then someone did the math on that and calculated that to be 80 percent of the obligation was ceded to ERC? A. That's what it would appear to be, yes. Q. And you multiply that by the amount of the expense and you come to ERC's portion, right? A. I think that's correct. Q. Is that number accurate? Does ERC have 80 percent of the responsibility? A. I don't know. Q. Is it something that is presently in dispute between you and Jefferson-Pilot?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	appropriate? I believe we take a ceding company's word for it rather than do a claim by claim review. Q. Well, you do do audit reviews and you get involved in litigation and you hand pick some for review, right? A. True. Q. 13 is a July 9, '98 letter from Shelton to Newkirk regarding Kearney and, again, the sharing of expenses? A. Correct. Q. 14 is some ERC internal documents regarding expenses paid on Kearney's claim? A. That's correct. Q. 15 is the cover page of a Motion For Summary Judgment in a case between J.E. Grote and Innomation. That appears in your Kearney claim file? A. I see that. Q. From a case filed in 1997. Do you know why that's in your claim file? A. I'm not certain.

	Page 98		Page 100
1	were some surveillance of Mr. Kearney in January	1	Q. 19 is a document labeled 0025
1	of 2001 and you were provided the report of the	2	reportedly from October of 2003. The first page
2	surveillance, is that accurate?	3	of series of medical records on Mr. Kearney.
3	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	4	You're still getting contemporaneous medical
4		5	records on Mr. Kearney here at ERC or ERAC?
5	A. It appears to be a portion of an	6	A. I last received some medical records
6	investigative report.	7	several months ago.
7	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Was that the case?	8	Q. What's the purpose for you receiving
8	Did you along the way get copies of all the	9	medical records?
9	surveillance that was being conducted and	10	A. For me to assist in the analysis of the
10	performed on the Kearney claim?	11	claim.
11	A. I don't know that I got copies of	12	Q. Next is Exhibit 20 labeled it's
12	anything or excuse me, of everything.	13	Bates No. 1913. This is purported an entry
13	Q. You were getting billed for it?A. Uh-huh.	14	regarding payment. This is actually never
14		15	actually signed by the Judge or presented to the
15		16	Judge as far as I'm aware, but it appears in
16	paid?	17	your claim file. Do I conclude correctly that
17	A. Correct.	18	drafts of motions and pleadings to be filed with
18	Q. Is it your testimony to the jury that you were getting billed for it, but you were not	19	the Court were shared with you before filing?
19	actually getting the surveillance reports?	20	A. On some occasions, yes.
20 21	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to form.	21	Q. Next is 21, which is a spreadsheet.
22	MR. BATY: Join.	22	This is titled Unpaid COLA Benefits. Do you
23	A. That's not unusual.	23	know why this appears in your file?
24	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Were you directing	24	A. I believe it's because it's in
25	that surveillance be performed?	25	association with Mr. Kearney's claim.
	Page 99		Page 101
1	A. I don't believe so.	1	Q. Next is 22 which is medical records on
2	Q. Did you at any point in time?	2	Mr. Kearney of a Dr. Shepard from November of
3	A. I don't recall.	3	2006, just eight months ago. I think we talked
4	Q. Next is Exhibit 17, which is the first	4	about this earlier. You get medical records on
5	page of some forensic accounting report of	5	Mr. Kearney even ones from recent time in order
6	Joseph Levy to Bob Mills from your file?	6	to assist in the evaluation, is that right?
7	A. Uh-huh.	7	A. That is correct.
8	Q. You're mindful that it's called	8	Q. Is his medical condition under analysis
9	Supplemental Report. You're mindful there were	9	presently?
10	some financial reviews of Mr. Kearney's records	10	MR. MEAGHER: Well, with regard
11	performed and included in your file?	11	to any discussions between the counsel group
12	A. I recall that there was a financial	12	during pendency of the litigation, I would
13	review done at some point, but that's the extent	13	object on the grounds of work product and
14	of my recollection.	14	attorney/client privilege.
15	Q. You're mindful of just one being done?	15	MR. ROBERTS: Are you instructing
16	A. I only recall one.	16	him not to answer?
17	Q. Next is Exhibit 18. And this is the	17	MR. BATY: I join in the
18	letter that Mr. Kearney received with the	18	objection, but it's to the extent that he can
19	lawsuit. I included it because I wanted you to	19	answer the question without getting into
20	tell me who Jane Neidermyer is who is shown in	20	discussions that you've had with counsel.
21	the blind copy?	21	MR. MEAGHER: Could you read the
22	A. As I indicated to you earlier, Jane	22	question back, please?
23	Neidermyer is the person that was in charge of	23	(Whereupon, the previous question
24	their claim operation, of Jefferson-Pilot's	24	was read back by the reporter.)
25	claim operation in Concord, New Hampshire.	25	

	Page 102		Page 104
1	A. I believe Mr. Kearney's medical	1	you when the deposition is concluded, counsel.
2	condition is at issue.	2	MR. MEAGHER: All right. Fine.
3	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) His present medical	3	Thank you.
4	condition?	4	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) So it's just a
5	A. His present medical condition.	5	routine exercise to review his medical records
6	Q. Outside the litigation whether or not	6	because he has an ongoing claim. That's what's
7	he qualifies for benefits today, whether he had	7	going on right now?
8	a lawsuit pending or not, is that your	8	A. Yes.
9	testimony?	9	Q. Are his credit card records being
10	A. Yes.	10	evaluated for that purpose?
11	Q. And you've been assisting in that	11	A. I don't know.
12	endeavor, correct?	12	MR. MEAGHER: Objection to the
13	A. I would like for you to define	13	form.
14	assisting.	14	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Have you sought his
15	Q. You're getting present medical records	15	records for that purpose?
16	for that purpose, correct?	16	A. Which records?
17	A. Yes. I received medical records	17	Q. Credit card records?
18	several months or at least several weeks ago. I	18	A. I have not sought those records.
19	can't remember the last time I was updated on	19	Q. Do you know if they are being sought
20	it, but it's probably been in the four to eight	20	for that purpose?
21	week range.	21	A. I believe so.
22	Q. What triggered the present analysis of	22	Q. Is the next one 24 which is a May 31,
23	his medical condition for his continued	23	2007 letter to Mr. Kearney from DMS, which comes
24	entitlement to benefits?	24	from your claim file?
25	A. Well, I believe an ongoing disability	25	A. I'm sorry, are you asking me if this
····	Page 103		Page 105
1	claim is subject to that type of analysis at any	1	comes from my claim file?
2	point in time.	2	Q. The next document is Exhibit 24, which
3	Q. You're mindful Mr. Kearney just had a	3	is a May 31, 2007 letter, correct?
4	heart attack?	4	A. That is correct.
5	A. No, I'm not.	5	Q. And this came from your claim file?
6	MR. MEAGHER: Is he going to be	6	A. I believe so.
7	available for deposition next week?	7	Q. This document that is just two weeks
8	MR. ROBERTS: You got a one	8	old?
9	track mind.	9	A. I believe so.
10	MR. MEAGHER: We want to know if	10	Q. And this doesn't relate to litigation.
11	he's incapacitated, certainly we will change the	11	This relates to his ongoing claim?
12	date.	12	A. Right.
13	MR. ROBERTS: You would	13	Q. And you're getting these documents
14	accommodate him?	14	contemporaneous with their issuance?
15	MR. MEAGHER: Well, I haven't	15	A. Correct.
16	been informed by you that that's a problem.	16	Q. I need one moment.
17	MR. ROBERTS: Your colleague	17	(Off the record)
18	knows.	18	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) Privilege log,
19	MR. MEAGHER: We have travel	19	Exhibit 1, can you turn to 2948 and 2949?
20	plans. Okay. So it's not going on Wednesday?	20	A. I have a non-chronological privilege
21	MR. ROBERTS: Let me proceed with	21	log. I'm sorry. I can look for it, but it
22	the deposition, please.	22	might take me
23	MR. MEAGHER: You don't want to	23	MR. BATY: What's the number
24	respond to me?	24	again?
25	MR. ROBERTS: I will respond to	25	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) On that document

	Page 106		Page 108
1	January 27, 2006, and it's Bates No. 2948.	1	again.
2	A. I got it.	2	Q. 3339, February '07.
3	Q. So you should be at document 02948 to	3	A. Okay, I have that.
4	02949, dated January 27, 2006 from Bill Ellis to	4	Q. This is an e-mail from Ellis to
5	Formus, Dempsey, Farabow, copy Callow. And the	5	Meagher, Formus, Dempsey, Farabow and Callow
6	subject matter is the Jay trial.	6	regarding Kearney's divorce status. How does
7	A. I see that.	7	that relate to his claim?
8	Q. Is this a misprint or does this relate	8	MR. MEAGHER: I'm going to
9	to Kearney?	9	object. This is work product and
10	A. I don't know.	10	attorney/client privilege.
11	Q. 2941 dated February 9th of '06.	11	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) So you're
12	MR. MEAGHER: What number?	12	investigating his divorce status?
13	Q. 2941 dated February 9th '06?	13	MR. BATY: I join in the
14	A. I got it.	14	objection to the extent this is work product and
15	Q. The subject matter concerns a voice	15	I instruct the witness not to answer that.
16	mail from Dorsey and Whitney, which is a law	16	A. On the advice of counsel I will not
17	firm. Are they a law firm that's been retained	17	respond to that.
18	on the Kearney claim?	18	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) 3344 to 3347.
19	A. I don't recall.	19	A. What's the date on that, sir?
20	Q. Can you turn to May 24, 2004,	20	Q. February 23rd, '07, from Meagher to you
21	Document 3261.	21	copying Formus and Farabow, an e-mail that says
22	A. What was the document number again,	22	"Re: Kearney records RVW-IME question mark,
23	please?	23	question mark." Do you know what the acronym
24	Q. 3261.	24	RVW stands for?
25	A. I have that.	25	MR. MEAGHER: Again, it's work
	Page 107		Page 109
1	Q. And the subject is Kearney, Jeffries	1	product, attorney/client.
2	and King. Do you know who Jeffries is?	2	MR. ROBERTS: The acronym RVW?
3	A. It rings a bell, but I can't tell you	3	MR. BATY: Join in the objection.
4	affirmatively that I know who it is.	4	And instruct the witness not to answer.
5	Q. Is that another claim you're handling?	5	A. On advice of counsel I won't respond.
6	A. No, I don't believe so.	6	Q. (By Mr. Roberts) You're indicating to
. 7	Q. Ever handled?	7	me what the word says, but you're not going to
8	A. I don't believe so.	8	tell me what it actually means?
9	Q. Do you know what it's relation to	9	MR. BATY: Same instruction.
10	Kearney is?	10	MR. ROBERTS: I'm asking counsel.
11	A. No, I don't.	11	I mean this is a document that you or your law
12	Q. Do you know who King is?	12	firm created and you shortened something to get
13	A. I believe I do.	13	into the space it looks like. You're not going
14	Q. That's a gentleman that filed a lawsuit	14	to tell me what RVW stands for?
15	against Jefferson-Pilot down south somewhere?	15	MR. BATY: No.
16	A. I believe in Mississippi.	16	Q. (By Mr Roberts) Who is ERAC's direct
17	Q. What is his association to Kearney?	17	parent?
18	A. I can't tell you without looking at the	18	A. They have had a business
19	document.	19	reorganization, so I can't state with certainty.
20	Q. Did he too have a residual disability	20	Q. Is there any entity that has liability
21	claim and litigation commenced and there was a	21	other than JP and ERC should there be liability
22	dispute about what the policy provided?	22	on Mr. Kearney's claim?
23	A. I don't recall.	23	A. Not to my knowledge.
	Q. Turn to 3339 dated February 28th, '07.	24	Q. You don't have any other reinsurance
24 25	A. Can you give me the document number	25	agreement or treaty with any other entity?

	Page 110		Page 112
1	A. There are retro-session agreements in	1	CERTIFICATE
2	place, but I don't know whether they are	2	I, Mary Lynn Cushing, a Certified
3	applicable to this particular reinsurance	3	Shorthand Reporter for the State of Missouri, do
4			hereby certify:
5	0		That prior to being examined the
6	no further questions.	6	witness was by me duly sworn;
7	A. Thank you.	7	That said deposition was taken down by
8	MR. MEAGHER: No questions.		me in shorthand at the time and place
9	MR. MARTIN: Time is 3:12. We		hereinbefore stated and was thereafter reduced
10	are going off the record.		to writing under my direction;
11	and going off the record.	11	That I am not a relative or employee or
12		12	attorney or counsel of any of the parties, or a
13		13	relative or employee of such attorney or
14		14	counsel, or financially interested in the
15		15	action.
16		16	WITNESS my hand and seal this
17		17	day of, 2007.
18		18	
19		19	
20		20	MARY LYNN CUSHING, CSR, CCR No. 1077
21		21	FEES DUE METROPOLITAN COURT REPORTERS, INC. :
22		22	\$ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF
23		23	\$ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT
24		24	ATTORNET FOR DEFENDANT
25		25	
1	Page 111	1	
2		2	June 28, 2007
3		3 4	Mr. William Dempsey
4			c/o Mr. Bruce E. Baty
5		5	Stinson, Morrison, Hecker, LLP 1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900
$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$		6	Kansas City, Missouri, 64106
7	WILLIAM DEMPSEY	7 8	RE: JEFFERSON-PILOT VS. CHRISTOPHER KEARNEY Dear Mr. Dempsey:
8	WILDIAM DEWFSET	9	Enclosed is your deposition, given in the
9		10	above-named matter, for your examination and signing. You will also find a signature page
10		1	and an errata sheet for your convenience in
11	Subscribed and Sworn to before	11	making any changes or corrections. Pursuant to the law, any change in "form or
12	me this, 2007.	13	substance" of an answer shall be accompanied with a statement of the reason given by you for
13	day of, 2007.	13	making such change.
14		14	Upon completion of your examination and reading.
15		15	please sign the enclosed signature page and
16	Notary Public	16	errata sheet and return them to this office in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. If we
17	rouny ruone		have not received the signed documents from you
18	County of	17	within 30 days from the date of this letter, an unsigned copy of your deposition will be filed.
19	State of	18	, ,
20	State of	19	Yours very truly,
20			METROPOLITAN COURT REPORTERS, INC.
22		20 21	
23	IEEEEDSON DII OT vo CUDISTODIJED KE ADVESV		By: MARY LYNN CUSHING, CSR, CCR No. 1077
23	JEFFERSON-PILOT vs. CHRISTOPHER KEARNEY	22 23	
25		24	
43		25	

ERRATA SHEET RE: JEFFERSON-PILOT VS. CHRISTOPHER	t KEARNEY	Company of the Compan	
DEPOSITION OF: WILLIAM DEMPSEY PG/LN NO. CORRECTION REASON FOR	R CHANGE		
:			
·			

• • •			
I certify that I have read my deposition in the above case and I request that no changes	n	(I)	
ha mada		THE COLUMN TO TH	
I certify that I have read my deposition in the above case and I request that the above	1	***	
changes be made. SIGNATURE OF DEPONENT:			
DATED:			
DATED:			

		**	

	75.22 76.6 16.20 5.04.20	
A	75:22 76:6,16 80:5 94:20	amended (1)
able (2)	address (2)	17:3
37:21 39:12	6:8 28:2	amount (10)
above-named (1)	adjacent (1)	13:7 18:6,11 20:17 21:9 84:6
113:9	40:5	84:16 88:16,16 95:14
absolute (2)	adjudicate (2)	amounts (2)
69:14 90:6	24:11,13	22:4 26:15
Absolutely (1)	adjudicated (1)	Amy (1)
13:2	27:6	65:24
accept (1)	adjudicating (2)	analysis (5)
21:11	59:18 60:2	90:22 100:10 101:8 102:22
accepted (2)	adjudication (1)	103:1
6:25 7:3	57:12	analyze (1)
accepts (1)	adjust (3)	59:22
21:14	91:16,24 92:2	Anderson's (1)
accommodate (1)	advice (5)	86:9
103:14	38:17,23 93:3 108:16 109:5	Andrew (1)
accompanied (1)	affiliated (1)	69:15
113:12	15:18	Andy (3)
account (2)	affirmatively (1)	68:23,24 70:3
34:10 48:23	107:4	and/or (1)
accounting (1)	afternoon (1)	84:9
99:5	6:3	announce (1)
accurate (8)	ago (6)	5:17
17:25 21:12 44:20 66:12	8:22 17:17 74:21 100:7	annual (1)
76:15 84:12 95:18 98:3	101:3 102:18	28:10
accustom (1)	agree (3)	answer (14)
31:5	21:11 53:22 92:15	29:7 30:16 54:21,23 55:1
acquired (1)	agreement (33)	88:25 89:3,20 93:18 101:16
67:10	16:17 17:2,5,10,15 18:3,19	101:19 108:15 109:4
acronym (2)	22:6,12 23:3 26:19,23,24	113:12
108:23 109:2	30:23 31:9 32:3,14,16,21	answered (4)
acronyms (1)	32:23 33:1,10 48:13,16	19:22 20:6 50:21 87:2
15:1	78:24,25 79:8 80:17,20	anticipating (1)
acting (1)	81:1 93:8 109:25 110:4	71:22
52:18	agreements (4)	anticipation (3)
action (5)	28:11 30:25 31:2 110:1	53:18 55:4 74:15
13:21,23 15:3,6 112:15	ahead (2)	anybody (1)
actual (3)	7:16 25:14	67:19
91:23 92:1 96:13	Allen (2)	anymore (1)
actuary (4)	64:19,21	34:6
28:2,16 68:10 92:4	allow (1)	anytime (1)
Adam (5)	88:24	56:22
2:13 5:19 65:24 68:25 69:1	allowed (1)	apologize (2)
Add (1)	89:3	7:18 84:19
8:4	alluding (1)	App (1)
addition (3)	87:12	81:24
27:20 31:19 42:12	amend (1)	apparently (2)
additional (5)	48:22	53:8 68:15

Filed 09/06/2007

76:5 86:18.20 28:3 104:25 109:10 appear (3) authority (1) assertion (2) 30:1 36:24 95:13 88:15 44:2.3 appearances (2) authorize (5) asserts (1) 2:1 5:8 88:18 96:8,10,17 98:15 44:4 appearing (7) 2:3,8,12,17,21 5:17,18 authorizing (1) assessment (1) 89:4 28:16 appears (12) authors (1) 82:23 83:9,22 84:23 85:7 assist (2) 74:22 100:10 101:6 94:2 95:2 97:17,24 98:5 available (1) assistant (4) 100:16,23 8:12,15 11:12 65:15 103:7 apples (2) aware (3) 53:4,4 assistants (1) 16:12 18:25 100:16 67:15 applicable (1) assisting (2) a.m (1) 110:3 5:5 102:11.14 application (7) associated (1) 48:4 49:21,22 50:5,8 56:1 B 30:5 82:2 back (17) association (2) applications (2) 10:2,6,18 14:24 37:11 48:4 100:25 107:17 81:21,21 61:16 64:20 71:1,22 81:22 applied (1) assume (5) 86:15 89:9,11,18 101:22,24 22:20 44:7 46:23 81:25 91:8 27:20 balance (1) appreciate (1) assumes (1) 18:13 35:20 43:8 ballpark (1) assumption (1) appropriate (4) 15:14 91:9 27:12 66:21 96:24 97:1 Barnes (2) attached (3) approximately (2) 69:5.6 43:23 44:9 92:12 8:22 87:6 based (6) April (1) attack (1) 18:19 27:19 28:4 71:6 79:19 103:4 83:23 81:24 attorney (14) apt (1) basis (8) 41:15.17 52:18 53:15 67:24 25:6 29:19 72:18 73:18 74:7 68:6,7,14 69:7,16 112:12 area (3) 80:13 91:20,21,22 112:13,22,23 9:11 23:16 63:10 Bates (5) attorney/client (8) arena (1) 81:9.16 97:23 100:13 106:1 54:5.11 77:17 87:19 88:22 12:17 **Baty (28) Argumentative (1)** 101:14 108:10 109:1 2:18 5:12,12 34:17 36:1 attributable (1) 93:16 39:11 50:20 54:13,19,22 51:15 arisen (1) 55:10 61:7 62:21 66:14,18 audit (3) 57:11 88:21 89:15,20 93:15,22 25:4 26:9 97:4 arrived (1) 98:22 101:17 105:23 audits (1) 35:16 108:13 109:3,9,15 113:4 59:13 Arthur (1) Beardshaw (1) authentic (3) 61:18 64:7 55:9,23 66:11 aside (2) began (2) authenticity (2) 49:16 50:23 10:3 32:17 55:17 66:20 asked (6) beginning (2) 16:1 19:21 20:5 50:20 64:1 author (5) 71:8 76:1 38:7 72:13 74:13 75:1 77:23 87:1 behalf (2) authored (3) asking (3)

1:16 93:12	94:8	colouleés J (1)
belief (2)		calculated (1)
42:13 51:19	blocks (2)	95:11
H .	80:12,15	calculation (1)
believe (74)	Bob (9)	95:3
11:12 14:11 15:11,21 16:25	8:23 9:2 36:10 37:21 38:9,11	call (1)
20:10 23:24 27:3,17 28:9	90:9,10 99:6	76:16
28:23 31:24 33:20 34:1	Bonzell (5)	called (3)
36:14,17,19,21 38:6,15	36:10 37:21 38:9,11,17	6:22 75:16 99:8
39:13 41:9,12,13,17,25	Bonzell's (1)	Callow (4)
42:15 50:11 51:14 57:21	36:24	65:24 67:25 106:5 108:5
58:24 61:24 62:9,17 64:21	born (1)	capacity (1)
65:15,20 67:8,24 68:3,10	91:6	28:24
68:13 69:6,7,12,16,25	bottom (4)	card (2)
75:12 76:12,22 77:5 80:22	47:12,23 81:9 95:3	104:9,17
86:1,9,16,20 88:13 89:21	Boulevard (1)	care (2)
90:10,21,25 96:6 97:1 99:1	2:7	12:13 23:11
100:24 102:1,25 104:21	Bowen (1)	Carl (1)
105:6,9 107:6,8,13,16	2:6	68:5
bell (3)	bracketed (1)	Carolina (2)
65:12 68:17 107:3	10:1	2:11 25:11
benefit (7)	break (3)	Carrie (1)
19:5 21:3 45:20,22 46:4 84:6	37:4 70:1,20	69:5
84:16	brief (3)	carried (1)
benefits (9)	35:4,5 54:2	28:17
18:23,24 19:1 21:22 45:8	briefly (1)	Carrier (2)
95:7 100:22 102:7,24	35:13	69:18,19
best (1)	bring (1)	carries (1)
83:18	21:9	28:12
Bey (2)	brought (3)	carry (1)
65:14,15	46:20 47:4,9	60:12
beyond (3)	Bruce (3)	case (22)
23:5 49:14 57:17	2:18 5:12 113:4	5:3 13:17,20 14:14,23 15:10
big (1)	bunch (1)	17:18 31:14 51:24 52:6,11
49:7	65:22	58:10 80:8 84:21,22 85:25
Bill (8)	Burrell (3)	86:1 97:16,20 98:7 114:18
63:20 68:12,19,20 77:23 80:2	65:23 68:2,3	114:19
90:7 106:4	business (19)	cases (3)
billed (3)	7:14 13:25 15:19 16:5 28:13	13:19 80:14 92:24
96:21 98:13,19	29:10 30:1 31:4,19,21	CCR (3)
billing (1)	32:10,12 45:7 59:10 73:5	1:17 112:20 113:21
27:11	79:20 85:19 94:8 109:18	CD (4)
Biscayne (1)	B-e-y (1)	39:9,11,13,16
2:7	65:14	cede (1)
bit (2)		20:18
7:17 71:3	<u>C</u>	ceded (6)
blind (1)	C (2)	20:15,16 84:6,16 95:8,12
99:21	112:1,1	ceding (1)
block (7)	cabinet (3)	97:1
16:5,24 21:7,12 28:13 73:5	40:9,11 81:18	Center (2)

71:8 59:18,22 60:2,3,16 62:11 2:6.23 columns (1) 63:5 64:4 65:18 67:4 68:16 Central (1) 69:19.24 70:15 71:17 73:2 71:5 5:5 combination (1) 74:14 75:22 76:6,16,25 certain (13) 25:22 11:24 26:11 33:3 38:15 77:3,8,20 78:8 80:6,24 come (4) 76:13,23,24 80:14 87:12 85:14 87:8 90:21,23 91:17 23:16 33:21 41:20 95:15 91:20,22 94:7,16,21 96:8 88:19 90:21 94:24 97:22 96:13,19,20 97:2,3,13,18,21 comes (3) certainly (10) 92:7 104:23 105:1 98:10 99:24,25 100:11,17 44:8 50:13 53:3,19,22 56:21 coming (2) 60:21 79:9 96:16 103:11 100:25 103:1 104:6,24 105:1,5,11 106:18 107:5,21 17:4 81:3 certainty (3) commenced (3) 69:14 90:6 109:19 108:7 109:22 5:1 51:5 107:21 claimant (1) Certified (1) 84:10 commensurate (2) 112:2 28:12 67:3 claimants (2) certify (3) comment (1) 112:4 114:17,19 30:6,13 claimed (2) 53:1 change (8) comments (1) 8:3 29:18 32:8 87:6 103:11 72:7,15 55:4 claims (45) 113:12.13 114:4 **Commissioners (1)** changed (1) 9:11.16 11:11 12:15,21 13:5 29:16 16:19 17:12 21:11 22:22.25 67:10 23:24 24:12,20,23,24 25:5 common (1) changes (4) 80:25 25:12,14,18,19,20 26:5,12 91:19 113:11 114:18,20 communicated (1) 26:15 28:22,24 29:1,23 characteristics (1) 90:3 30:8 33:3 38:16 54:18 55:3 46:23 communications (1) characterization (1) 60:8 63:10 64:16,25 76:21 78:7 80:5 90:19,24 91:24 39:18 76:15 companies (5) charge (2) 92:2 13:25 20:25 22:24 27:25 63:9 99:23 client (2) 32:8 Chris (6) 34:5 53:16 company (19) 5:15 6:4 44:23 63:24 64:4 clients (4) 1:6 2:4,9 6:22 8:1,23 9:20 30:23 33:6 60:5 79:7 84:4 14:3 15:18 21:5 22:7,16 closed (1) Christopher (5) 30:12 31:3,21 71:21 80:4,5 1:9 2:21 111:23 113:7 114:2 7:13 80:9 coffee (1) chronologically (1) company's (4) 37:15 87:10 20:3,8 30:23 97:2 Cohen (4) Cincinnati (1) 35:5 68:23,24 70:3 compartmentalized (1) 2:24 32:11 **City (4)** Cohill (1) compels (1) 1:21 2:19 6:23 113:6 64:13 COLA(1) 80:2 claim (116) compiled (2) 17:25 18:4,7,16 19:10,13,20 100:22 50:25 51:18 colleague (1) 20:2 21:4,20 22:4,10,16 complete (1) 103:17 23:15,22,22 24:5,6,6,15 44:5 collect (2) 25:1,8,24 26:1,7,10,25 27:5 completion (1) 39:12,24 27:23 28:6,8,14,20 29:8 113:14 30:5,7,17,19,22 31:6,10,12 college (1) complying (1) 31:16 33:8,14,16,18 49:13,13 39:6 column (1) 50:1 53:9,25 56:12 57:12

computer (1) 51:24 52:7 85:14,20 93:5 94:13,22 95:17 97:11 40:7 contents (2) 97:14 98:17 101:7 102:12 concern (4) 25:1.8 102:16 105:3,4,15 context (7) 13:19 15:3,23 16:16 **CORRECTION (1)** 20:16 24:16 45:4.16.18 63:16 concerns (2) 114:4 12:2 106:15 82:22 corrections (1) conclude (9) contingent (1) 113:11 74:20,25 78:10,13,17,19,21 88:7 correctly (1) 79:18 100:17 continuance (2) 100:17 concluded (1) 49:15 86:2 correspondence (9) 104:1 continued (3) 19:12 36:9 37:20 50:15 conclusion (2) 3:5 4:1 102:23 51:16 52:1,7 58:15 65:10 71:23 78:15 contract (3) correspondences (1) Concord (3) 13:23 15:6 62:20 19:16 64:17 69:21 99:25 convenience (1) counsel (37) condition (6) 113:10 2:14 5:7 9:16,20 10:3,10,20 59:14 101:8 102:2,4,5,23 conversations (1) 11:1,5,9,11 22:23 28:24 conduct (1) 53:15 34:14 35:12 36:20 39:10 79:20 Cook (1) 41:24 54:9,13 58:16 66:15 conducted (1) 64:11 68:8,24 69:1,3 70:8 75:4 98:9 copied (4) 92:9 101:11,20 104:1 47:23,24 52:12,16 conference (3) 108:16 109:5,10 112:12,14 35:18,23,25 copier (1) County (1) confidential (1) 81:13 111:18 92:17 copies (3) couple (3) 48:13 98:8,11 confirm (1) 58:25 70:18 74:21 84:7 copy (11) course (9) confused (2) 39:14 40:2,4 42:22,24 43:10 19:16 34:24 36:3,19 51:23 15:1 24:3 60:23 61:6 99:21 106:5 57:11 66:7 85:19 87:16 conjunction (2) 113:17 Court (7) 82:2.3 copying (1) 1:1 3:2 6:6 18:2 100:19 Conley (1) 108:21 112:21 113:19 10:2 corporation (17) cover (2) 7:4,10,12,15 8:2 9:12 13:24 connection (2) 23:10 97:15 55:11 56:12 14:21,25 15:2,12 18:14 **CPA** (1) consider (1) 20:19 52:19 55:12 60:10 68:22 29:5 83:24 create (2) consult (1) correct (76) 17:3 83:19 75:4 7:22 8:14,17 13:1 15:17 17:9 created (7) consulted (1) 17:18 18:21 19:14,23 20:7 37:15 75:21 83:15 91:1,2,4 88:10 21:22 22:19 23:7,8,13,20 109:12 consulting (10) 34:20 35:8,10,21 38:1,4,10 creating (1) 32:3,14 33:10 78:24,25 79:8 38:12,13 39:4,19 42:10 47:19 80:17,20 81:1 93:8 48:7 49:2,6 50:1,2 52:11 creation (1) contained (1) 53:6 54:12 55:6 58:13,14 75:4 38:23 58:17 59:25 67:5,13 72:8,9 credit (3) contemporaneous (3) 72:23,25 73:3,7,13 74:2 28:10 104:9,17 50:17 100:4 105:14 75:9 77:22 80:1 81:11 83:5 Creek (1) contemporaneously (4) 84:1,8 85:9 88:6 90:15 91:8 3:3

68:9.10.14.19.20 depend (1) critical (2) 30:17 David (2) 12:12 31:5 12:24 78:3 depending (3) Croft (2) 17:21 30:24 31:9 David's (1) 64:15,16 depends (1) 11:12 **CSR (3)** 23:2 1:17 112:20 113:21 day (4) 1:18 34:4 111:12 112:17 depo (1) Cuban (1) 35:9 days (1) 87:9 DEPONENT (1) current (1) 113:17 deal (1) 114:21 84:9 deposition (25) Cushing (4) 34:6 1:15 5:1,3 13:10,16 14:15 1:17 112:2,20 113:21 Dear (2) 92:21 113:8 34:13 35:12,15,17 50:15 customer (2) death (1) 52:1,8 58:19,22 92:13 79:12,21 103:7,22 104:1 112:7 113:9 cut (1) 65:21 81:13 decade (1) 113:17 114:3,17,19 79:25 derived (1) Cynthia (2) 29:15 64:15,16 December (2) describe (1) 37:19 38:2 c-e-d-e-d (1) decided (1) 16:14 84:18 described (4) 54:9 C-1-02-479 (2) 8:19 23:12 74:2,4 1:8 5:4 decision (3) description (2) 31:7 62:12,16 C.J(2)21:13 25:7 65:25 67:23 decisions (2) designate (1) 52:20.24 c/o (1) 92:17 decrease (2) 113:4 designating (1) 91:11,12 D deep (1) 54:4 Dallas (1) desired (1) 40:10 68:14 29:2 defendant (4) **Dan** (1) 1:10.17 5:14 112:23 details (1) 13:6 76:6 define (1) Darlene (1) determinant (1) 102:13 67:21 definition (1) 29:6 data (1) determine (1) 53:20 29:19 degree (1) 54:18 date (14) develops (1) 6:11 5:4 15:13 17:15 18:5,19 19:3 27:5 Dempsey (44) 22:2,4 46:10 50:18 76:1 1:16 2:17 3:7.11.12.13.14.15 Diane (2) 103:12 108:19 113:17 64:9 69:10 3:16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23 **dated** (13) 3:24,25 4:2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 dictated (1) 43:22 71:16 72:22 74:5 82:9 18:18 5:3,13,23 6:9,10 37:12 82:14 83:20 96:2 106:4,11 42:18 55:14 61:13,17 71:2 different (3) 106:13 107:24 114:22 80:3 106:5 108:5 111:7 9:3 26:22 32:7 dating (1) differentiate (1) 113:4.8 114:3 81:22 Dennison (1) 59:8 Dave (1) 10:1 direct (4) 65:3 department (3) 17:22 23:21 80:24 109:16 Davenport (5) 6:20 28:15.16 directed (2)

A .		
62:7 93:7	doc (1)	duty (2)
directing (4)	76:1	duly (2) 5:24 112:6
47:15,18,20 98:24	document (94)	
direction (1)	1 ' '	duties (1)
112:10	32:24 36:5,6,7,22 37:16,22	11:23
	39:1,1 41:3,5,6,7,14,16,18	duty (1)
directly (1)	41:20,23 42:2,12,16 43:23	26:14
41:11	43:23 44:10,12,15,22 45:9	D-E-M-P-S-E-Y (1)
directory (1)	46:10,13 47:24 49:17 51:21	6:9
28:21	55:4 68:16 71:8,12,19 72:4	E
directs (2)	72:12,16,22 73:15,16 74:3	E (5)
80:2,10	74:10,15 75:14,24 76:1,2,4	2:5,18 112:1,1 113:4
disability (34)	76:11,13,16,18,21 77:4,4,10	
2:4,13,14 5:10,19 12:2,3,13	77:15 78:20 81:24,25 82:3	earlier (7) 8:19 50:11 55:11 56:3 92:3
12:14,17,21 13:5,8,17,18,20	82:4,15,19,20 83:3,9,13,15	99:22 101:4
15:24 23:6,25 27:2 29:16	83:16,19,22 86:7,17,19,21	
31:22 32:3,14 45:7,19	91:5 95:9 97:23,24 100:1	Edward (1)
49:15 65:16 83:11,11 85:14	105:2,7,25 106:3,21,22	6:9
86:3 102:25 107:20	107:19,25 109:11	effort (3)
disagree (1)	documents (60)	56:9 74:20,25
55:22	17:16 36:2,20 39:6,12,14,21	eight (2)
discovery (1)	39:25 40:1,2,4,6,14,18,21	101:3 102:20
14:13	40:23 41:2,21 48:2,5,9,10	either (3)
discuss (1)	48:11,13,20 50:6,7,14,16,24	26:5 84:23 93:1
80:14	51:3,4,6,10,18,20 52:11	Electric (9)
discussed (1)	53:14,24 54:5 55:8,16,18	10:1 15:7,8,11 17:11 22:6,8
56:1	59:2 66:13 71:6,16 74:19	22:17 29:24
discussing (1)	74:21,24 75:3,7 77:7 81:4	electronic (4)
78:7	81:17,22 82:5 97:12 105:13	40:1,6 59:2,5
discussion (2)	113:16	electronically (3)
54:25 55:11	Doe (1)	39:17 44:14,18
discussions (5)	24:4	Ellis (7)
52:22 62:1 87:20 101:11,20	Doe's (2)	35:4 65:21 67:25 77:23 78:7
dispute (3)	24:14 28:20	106:4 108:4
95:22,24 107:22	doing (1)	Elm (1)
District (4)	37:4	2:10
1:1,2 14:8,22	dollars (3)	employed (7)
DIVISION (1)	21:9 22:18 96:13	6:24 7:5 68:6,11,22 69:20
1:3	Dorsey (1)	70:16
divorce (2)	106:16	employee (7)
108:6,12	dozens (1)	63:2 64:21 65:2 69:6,13
DMS (35)	79:4	112:11,13
24:17 33:4,9,13,15 38:12	Dr (1)	Employees (2)
47:23,25 64:21 65:2 68:22	101:2	7:7,8
68:24 69:1,6,7,13,17 78:24	drafts (5)	employer (1)
79:12,24 80:3,7,10,11,12,16	58:6,9,11,15 100:18	10:9
80:25 81:1 90:19,20 91:2,3	drives (1)	Employers (17)
92:7 93:7 104:23	79:11	7:3,6,14,24 8:1 9:11 13:24
DMS's (1)	DUE (1)	14:21,25 15:2,12 18:13
94:2	112:21	20:19 52:18 55:13 60:9

examining (1) 28:11,12,14,18 29:1,9 30:1 83:23 78:20 30:6,8 31:6,10 32:6,7,7,10 employment (4) exchange (1) 32:13,22 33:3,6,10 44:25 6:17 32:18 48:18,19 20:21 45:6 46:1,13 48:8,12,18,19 enclosed (5) excluding (1) 85:16 92:22 113:9,15,16 48:21 49:21,23,25 50:17 53:4,8 56:25 58:4 61:25 96:12 encompass (1) exclusive (1) 62:2.6 66:22 67:1 73:2.6.12 53:15 86:23 73:21,25 78:8 79:22 83:15 endeavor (1) 83:18 84:7,18 85:7,15,19 excuse (2) 102:12 86:12,19,23 90:18,21 91:1 12:13 98:12 engage (3) 91:24 92:2 94:7 95:8,12,18 exercise (4) 80:10,11,13 54:15 91:23 92:1 104:5 97:12 100:5 109:21 engaged (2) exhibit (46) ERC's (5) 32:12 60:15 16:15 29:10 49:4 52:16 3:11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19 engaging (1) 3:20,21,22,23,24,25 4:2,3,4 95:15 31:3 errata (3) 4:5,6,7,8,9 42:20 44:23 entered (3) 113:10,15 114:1 61:13 66:12 81:9 82:9,12 32:13,17 33:10 essence (1) 83:3,8,22 85:6 86:7,15,16 entire (4) 87:4 90:18 94:12 96:2 99:4 21:14 16:20 31:10 77:3 92:18 essentially (3) 99:17 100:12 105:2,19 entirely (1) Exhibits (4) 26:22 34:15 70:13 25:10 3:10 4:11 42:18 81:5 establish (3) entirety (2) exist (2) 27:12,14,18 26:1 77:8 26:13 55:25 established (1) entitlement (1) 91:18 existed (1) 102:24 32:17 entity (4) etcetera (2) expense (1) 10:15 62:6 109:20,25 47:10 51:16 evaluated (1) 95:15 entries (2) expenses (9) 104:10 61:2,5 66:23 67:2 94:24 95:1 96:15 evaluation (1) entry (1) 96:16.17 97:10.13 101:6 100:13 experience (1) event (1) envelope (1) 27:20 87:23 113:16 explain (1) equals (1) events (1) 59:7 26:20 86:11 evidence (2) expounds (1) equitable (2) 85:10 35:20 66:20 93:1,12 express (2) **ERAC (24)** exact (4) 59:23 60:1 8:1,5 10:16 15:1,5,8,16 19:6 15:13 16:23 19:3 62:25 21:6,20 31:10 32:7,9 39:20 exactly (3) extent (4) 21:24 48:24 82:16 24:24 99:13 101:18 108:14 40:18.20.25 41:1,22 49:25 58:4 70:9,18 100:5 examination (4) e-mail (3) 67:18 108:4,21 3:8 6:1 113:9,14 **ERAC's (2)** e-mails (4) 16:15 109:16 examine (2) 19:13,15 39:17 51:25 ERC (95) 24:24 26:12 8:4,7,16 10:3 11:6 12:19 examined (2) F 15:5,15,20 16:18,18,23 25:25 112:5 F (1) 17:7,10,23 21:20 22:12.23 examiner (1) 112:1 69:19 26:16,19 27:5,14,22 28:4

Page 39 of 58

fact (7) filed (16) 27:5 46:5 22:21 52:17 66:9 76:13 4:11 14:10 21:20 22:5 26:15 follows (1) 78:17.22 82:7 27:1 48:4 51:25 58:7 66:24 5:25 factor (1) 81:21 91:17 97:20 100:18 forensic (1) 29:4 107:14 113:17 99:5 factors (1) **files (12)** form (32) 29:5 12:4 29:12 30:2,16 33:12 11:22,25 18:4 23:15 30:5,7 facts (3) 41:8 49:5 78:23 92:22 93:6 37:24 45:17 46:13,21 47:5 22:1 35:20 84:11 93:6 49:17 50:3 53:7,21 65:19 Fair (1) filing (3) 71:25 78:12 84:13 85:4 37:5 58:13 78:6 100:19 87:5,11 90:18,22 91:1,2,4 fairly (1) **fill** (1) 93:17 94:9 98:4.21 104:13 57:16 10:14 113:12 familiar (6) filling (1) formally (1) 45:6 53:11,12 61:21 63:15 9:21 63:3 69:12 financial (9) forms (3) far (7) 59:14 63:3 64:17 67:12 68:7 49:13,15 85:20 17:19 25:24 63:11 84:12 69:4,21 99:10,12 formulas (1) 95:25 96:1 100:16 financially (1) 27:19 Farabow (9) 112:14 formulated (1) 2:10 5:20 35:3 65:25 69:2,3 find(1)29:15 113:10 106:5 108:5,21 Formus (9) February (12) **Fine (1)** 2:14 5:19 35:3 65:24 68:25 14:10 68:16 71:16,23 72:4,8 104:2 69:1 106:5 108:5,21 74:10 106:11.13 107:24 **firm (5)** Fort (1) 108:2,20 67:25 68:4 106:17,17 109:12 31:17 Federal (1) first (7) forward (1) 6:6 5:24 9:25 88:23 89:2,15 99:4 17:4 FEES (1) forwarded (1) 100:2 112:21 **fits** (1) 31:13 Felgate (1) 12:16 Foster (1) 9:6 **five (8)** 65:3 Felgate's (1) 10:4 34:22 75:20,25 76:2,4 four (4) 9:9 87:16 94:19 78:5 82:13,14 102:20 Fifth (1) five-hour (1) front (1) 2:23 34:24 20:1 figure (1) flattened (1) **full** (1) 15:14 8:25 81:12 file (56) flip (1) fully (1) 17:24 21:11 24:5 25:1,8 60:25 23:4 31:10 40:5,8,11 49:7,8,13 floor (1) function (1) 49:16,21,23 50:6,8,10 51:7 35:14 25:4 55:24 56:1,25 57:10 58:1,4 Florida (2) further (2) 59:1,4,6,10,12,15 62:7,13 2:7 87:22 93:3 110:6 75:22 76:6.16.25 77:3.9 focus (2) F-e-l-g-a-t-e (1) 80:3,24 81:24 82:5 83:6 71:3 77:10 9:8 92:8 94:7,21 97:18,21 99:6 focused (1) \mathbf{G} 99:11 100:17,23 104:24 13:5 Gallien (1) 105:1.5 follow (2)

Document 183

10

82:18,20 86:8,10 96:4 87:13,18 88:21,24 92:25 63:13 happen (2) 103:6,20 104:7 108:8 109:7 Gasser (1) 31:14 85:18 109:13 110:10 65:24 good (5) happened (2) gathered (3) 34:8 48:17 6:3 7:11 70:20 79:12,21 31:12 51:20 82:1 Goodman (3) hard (3) gathering (1) 39:14 40:1.4 64:9 69:10.13 39:5 Harold (1) graduate (1) Gaum (1) 75:23 6:15 63:18 graduated (1) Hays (1) **GE (2)** 31:17 31:17 10:10 15:16 Graydon (1) head (6) general (16) 2:22 9:10 38:16 55:20 64:16 2:22 9:20 10:1,3,10,20 11:1,5,9 67:8 15:7,8,11 17:11 22:6,8,16 great (1) 81:8 heading (1) 29:24 greater (4) 46:3 generally (1) 21:21 22:8,13 29:2 health (2) 24:1 Greensboro (4) 7:14 9:10 generic (1) heard (1) 2:11 24:22 25:4 26:9 47:7 Grote (1) 16:6 gentleman (2) hearing (3) 97:16 10:5 107:14 58:23,24,25 grounds (2) George (1) hearsay (1) 54:17 101:13 69:8 16:9 group (6) Geraldine (5) 6:23 12:13,13 13:5 91:20 heart (1) 61:22,23 62:2,19 65:20 103:4 getting (10) 101:11 Hecker (3) grow (1) 7:16 15:1 18:22 98:13,19,20 100:4 101:19 102:15 91:10 1:20 2:18 113:5 held (1) guess (4) 105:13 73:18 11:24 26:21 46:6 66:10 give (6) helped (1) guidance (1) 21:10 37:1,4 52:25 93:3 17:2 89:5 107:25 G-a-l-l-i-e-n (1) helps (1) given (9) 59:22 13:9 20:17 22:1,5 34:10 63:14 hereinbefore (1) G-a-u-m (1) 52:11 88:15 113:9,13 63:18 112:9 gives (1) Hey (1) 44:24 H 21:7 giving (1) half (1) high (1) 38:17 35:24 60:8 go (20) Hampshire (3) hire (1) 6:13 10:18 19:18 22:25 23:5 64:18 69:21 99:25 61:22 25:3,10 26:9 30:22 31:16 hand (2) history (2) 37:3 39:24 45:14 55:15 97:5 112:16 6:18 87:8 60:5,8 61:1,5,8 82:12 handled (1) hold (1) goes (2) 107:7 83:6 21:6 65:25 handling (3) honestly (3) **going (23)** 77:21 78:8 107:5 26:2 51:11 79:1 5:6 21:8,13 36:25 37:8 54:22 handwriting (5) hour (2) 54:25 61:1,4,11 70:23

		1
25 24 20 2	16.16	
35:24 39:2	46:16	97:17
hours (2)	included (2)	inquiring (1)
34:22 87:16	99:11,19	83:10
house (1)	including (3)	inside (1)
87:10	34:22 57:19 58:6	11:5
housed (1)	incorrectly (1)	instruct (4)
30:6	7:20	54:23 55:1 108:15 109:4
Hughes (4)	increase (1)	instructed (1)
63:20,24 64:4 90:7	91:14	87:15
hundreds (2)	incurred (1)	instructing (2)
79:2,10	23:1	54:20 101:15
Huy (1) 61:18	indemnity (1) 26:16	instruction (1)
		109:9
hypothetical (1) 30:5	INDEX (2) 3:5 4:1	insurance (16)
H-u-y (1)		1:5 2:4,9 6:19 12:3,7,10,12
61:18	Indian (1) 3:3	14:19 17:13 20:24 21:5
01.10	Indianapolis (1)	23:6,11 29:16 82:2
I	10:14	insured (5) 21:1 26:5 27:1 60:5 93:13
idea (7)	indicated (3)	i e
44:13,16,21 46:12,18 63:19	56:3 62:17 99:22	insureds (5)
64:6	indicates (16)	33:5,5 60:5 92:11,23 insurer (5)
identification (2)	44:22 45:9 46:19 71:19 74:9	15:4 16:11 20:17 27:18
42:19 61:14	74:18 75:18 76:9 77:19	31:11
identified (11)	78:2,4 84:6 85:16 91:5 95:9	intend (1)
3:10 4:1 25:14,21 36:12,15	97:25	21:8
36:18,21 54:3 66:5 92:11	indicating (1)	intention (1)
identifies (1)	109:6	25:11
44:25	individual (21)	interact (1)
identify (7)	9:3 10:13 12:14,16,21 13:3,4	80:9
25:13,17,19 26:7,11 29:1	13:8,16,18 15:24 21:1 23:6	interacted (1)
37:16	27:1 29:19 30:8 45:7 91:20	66:6
Identifying (1)	91:22,24 92:2	interactions (1)
39:9	individuals (3)	63:4
illness (2)	88:11,18 89:4	interest (1)
12:12 31:5	individual's (1)	52:17
IME (2)	9:24	interested (2)
58:3,5	information (25)	60:14 112:14
immediately (1)	27:9,17 28:25 29:2 30:11,13	internal (1)
40:5	31:11 45:5 46:14 57:5,8,11	97:12
important (2)	57:13,15,19 59:12,13,17,21	internally (1)
93:10,19	85:17 86:3 94:3,4,6,25	29:1
inadvertently (1)	informed (1)	interpret (1)
92:10	103:16	26:21
incapacitated (1)	inherited (1)	interrupting (1)
103:11	50:10	84:19
inch (1)	initially (1)	investigate (2)
49:10	23:22	80:6 92:25
include (1)	Innomation (1)	investigating (1)
) ´	5 6 \ ⁷ /

Kansas (11) 85:2 89:25 93:3,14 94:8 108:12 1:21 2:19 3:4 6:14.19.23 7:1 95:22 96:21 107:15 111:23 investigative (2) 7:5 14:5 25:11 113:6 113:7 114:2 84:9 98:6 Karen (1) Jefferson-Pilot's (4) invitation (1) 63:18 20:3 26:6 96:25 99:24 26:6 Katherine (1) Jeffries (2) involved (20) 10:13 107:1.2 16:7,23 19:12,15,19 33:13,15 Kearney (65) Jeremy (1) 33:15 49:1,3 60:2 65:17 1:9 2:21 5:15 6:5 16:12,16 3:1 66:4 68:15 70:14 76:21 17:21 18:4,22,25 21:17,22 job (2) 78:7 79:15 80:12 97:5 11:23 24:11 22:2,15 30:12 40:14 44:23 involvement (11) 48:20 49:4 56:2 58:3 62:3,8 13:4,7 23:21 24:14,25 26:4 Joe (1) 62:14 63:24 65:18 66:25 20:25 48:23,25 51:18 60:9 75:15 John (12) 68:16 71:22 74:14 76:19 involving (2) 77:1.25 78:6 81:22 84:5 2:5 5:9 10:2 24:4,14 28:20 14:19 86:3 85:21 86:3 87:9 88:8 91:6 in-house (3) 64:13 65:5,6,8 86:9 92:22 91:11 92:23 94:4 96:8 97:9 Johnson (6) 68:7 69:3 70:8 97:17 98:1,10 99:18 100:3 61:22,23 62:2,10,19 65:20 issuance (1) 100:5 101:2,5 103:3 104:23 join (7) 105:14 106:9,18 107:1,10,17 50:22 54:19 93:24 98:22 issue (2) 108:22 111:23 113:7 114:2 101:17 108:13 109:3 84:23 102:2 Kearney's (35) Joseph (1) issued (5) 16:10 17:12,18 18:16 19:13 99:6 16:13 55:12 58:17 60:18 20:2 24:2 25:24 26:1 31:14 JP (8) 95:6 26:17,25 33:18 86:13,23 93:7 33:8,14,16,18 56:12 57:6,9 issues (1) 58:16 59:9,14 62:10 64:4 96:5 109:21 96:9 69:24 77:3 78:8 88:4,11 Judge (2) items (2) 90:23 94:25 97:13 99:10 39:16 47:21 100:15,16 100:25 102:1 108:6 109:22 judgment (2) J keep (1) 38:22 97:16 Jane (4) 41:1 July (3) 63:1,2 99:20,22 82:25 92:6 97:8 **kept** (1) January (6) 18:12 June (9) 23:23 65:11 84:4 98:1 106:1 kind (6) 1:19 5:4 7:13 51:6 82:24 106:4 12:10 21:12 32:13 47:12 94:11,14 96:3 113:2 Jay (1) 88:3 96:15 jurisdiction (3) 106:6 **King (2)** 46:17 47:3.6 Jefferson-Pilot (75) 107:2,12 jury (11) 1:5 2:3,9 5:10,20 14:1 16:11 Knoll (1) 16:14 18:2,9 19:4 20:1,14 16:13,16,18,21,24 17:8,24 67:16 22:22 25:2 32:19 53:13 18:7,12 19:6 20:18 21:17 98:18 know (122) 22:7 23:7,15,23 24:4,15,16 9:14 10:25 11:3 15:13 16:2,6 J.E(1)24:21 25:5,15 26:5,14,18 17:19,20 18:15 19:9 20:1 97:16 27:6,10,15,24 28:6,9 29:3 20:13 22:20 25:24 32:16,22 J.L (1) 29:23 31:20 33:5 34:10 32:24 33:7,8,13,14 34:3 61:20 38:16 48:23 51:6 53:5 36:11,16 38:18 41:10 42:1 K 62:18 63:3,8,10 66:24 67:9 44:11 46:16,25 47:15,19,22 Kahn (1) 68:11 69:4.20 73:5,22,25 47:24 48:1,17,24 49:7,22 76:7 77:9 79:7 83:17,24 92:23 50:4 51:11,19 54:14,24

	1	1
55:2 56:4,21,23,24 61:18	lawsuits (4)	32:12
62:15 63:7,11,13 64:8,10	46:20 47:3 57:6,9	Lisa (1)
64:12,14,20,22 65:1,3,6,8	lawyer (12)	64:5
66:9 67:9,17,20,22 68:20	6:4 8:9 11:8 35:6 46:22 55:3	list (8)
69:9 70:6 74:4 76:23,24	62:2 63:11 65:7 77:24 88:4	24:22,23 25:18 47:11,12,16
77:6 78:9 79:1,1,9 82:12	88:12	47:20 65:25
84:12,14,15,20,21,22 85:3,5	lawyers (11)	litigate (1)
85:18,23 86:8,14,18,25	10:24 11:4 12:19 17:2 34:25	46:24
90:5,6 91:15 92:14 93:9,20	35:7 36:4 54:15 65:17,23	litigating (2)
94:6,10,17 95:20,25 96:1,3	66:4	59:24 60:3
96:20 97:20 98:11 100:23	layout (1)	litigation (36)
103:10 104:11,19 106:10	46:14	12:2 19:14 30:20 50:12,13,16
107:2,4,9,12 108:23 110:2	lead (1)	50:19 51:5,9,23 52:9,15,17
knowledge (9)	26:20	52:21,23 53:5,17,18 55:5
28:4 39:23 46:15 50:23	legal (8)	56:16 60:6,8,13 66:8 67:9
63:12 65:8 83:18 91:3	2:14 38:17,23 46:19 65:15	70:17 71:22 74:16 77:24
109:23	66:23 67:1 96:14	83:14 85:1 97:5 101:12
knows (1)	letter (26)	102:6 105:10 107:21
103:18	37:20 38:2,9,19 42:4,16,21	little (3)
Kristin (1)	43:4,22 44:4,6,9 82:9,14	7:16 46:10 71:3
67:16	83:23 84:12 92:7 94:12,20	LLP (5)
K-n-o-l-l (1)	94:23 96:2 97:8 99:18	1:20 2:6,18,23 113:5
67:16	104:23 105:3 113:17	locate (1)
	let's (6)	37:22
L	10:18 20:23 24:18 61:8 71:2	located (1)
L (1)	92:15	40:4
1:9	level (2)	Loftin (3)
labeled (3)	8:25 60:9	36:10 37:21 38:8
83:22 100:1,12	Levy (1)	Loftin's (1)
laid (2)	99:6	38:14
51:17 71:4	liability (9)	log (34)
Lainner (4)	26:20 28:5,7,13 53:9 60:12	19:18 28:21 36:13,15,18,23
8:8,9,13,23	67:3 109:20,21	36:25 37:1,14,15 54:3
Lancaster (1)	life (4)	57:23 60:17 65:11,22 66:11
67:19	7:13 9:10 12:12 23:11	67:18 71:3 72:24 74:8,17
large (1)	lifetime (7)	75:5,8,17 76:8 77:18 78:1,4
17:2	45:3,8,10,12,15,18,20	78:18,22 81:7 94:19 105:18
largely (1)	limb (1)	105:21
50:12	45:14	logical (1)
late (1)	limited (1)	78:14
7:13	13:7	logically (1)
lateral (2)	Lincoln (7)	46:4
40:5,8	63:3 64:17 67:11,12 68:7	logs (1)
law (10)	69:4,20	66:19
1:19 6:11,13,14 67:25 68:4	Linda (1)	London (1)
106:16,17 109:11 113:12	65:14	92:24
lawsuit (10)	line (3)	long (6)
6:5 30:9 47:8 62:7,13 66:24	31:4 89:11,18	12:2,12 15:10 23:11 34:21
78:6 99:19 102:8 107:14	lines (1)	35:22
	,	

look (20) 22:25 24:20,22 26:8 30:22 37:14 42:23 43:7 51:10,21 51:22 56:9 60:20,25 71:15 75:10.19 86:15 94:18 105:21 looked (3) 38:20,21 56:11 looking (4) 25:12 75:12 89:5 107:18 looks (1) 109:13 Lori (1) 63:13 loss (9) 16:19 17:15 18:6,20 19:3 20:17,20 22:5,13 lot (2) 26:21 53:23 lunch (1) 34:22 Lynn (6) 1:17 69:15,16 112:2,20 113:21 L-a-i-n-n-e-r (1) 8:13

```
M
mail (1)
106:16
mailed (1)
39:11
main (2)
2:15 32:20
maintain (3)
27:25 28:4,6
maintained (8)
27:23,24 28:22 40:13 53:24
 57:25 59:3 81:17
maintains (1)
28:9
majority (1)
60:7
making (4)
39:9 52:20 113:11,13
manage (2)
80:12,15
Management (10)
2:4,13,14 5:11,19 23:25
```

```
31:22 32:3,14 65:16
manner (2)
93:2.12
March (4)
72:13 76:5 77:1 84:4
Maria (1)
70:5
mark (6)
37:1 68:9,10,14 108:22,23
marked (6)
3:10 4:1 42:19 61:14 81:4,8
marketing (1)
31:5
Martin (11)
3:1 5:2,16,21 37:7,10 61:10
 61:15 70:22,25 110:9
Martinez (1)
70:5
Mary (4)
1:17 112:2,20 113:21
Mass (3)
14:4 15:4 33:5
Massachusetts (1)
2:16
material (1)
92:22
materials (5)
41:13 49:4,11,12 52:13
math (2)
91:8 95:10
matter (9)
 14:19 31:7 47:10 61:24
  63:21 77:20 106:6,15 113:9
matters (2)
52:23 60:4
McGaff (1)
65:23
Meagher (68)
 2:5 5:9.9.18 12:4 19:21 20:5
  29:12 30:2,15 33:12 34:18
  35:19 36:1 37:23 42:22
  43:1,6,9,11,19 45:17 46:21
  47:5 50:3,22 53:7,21 54:16
  55:19.21 60:22 61:4 65:19
  65:21 66:19 71:25 78:12,16
  84:13 85:4 87:1,5,11,18
  92:9,16,20 93:17,24 94:9
```

98:4,21 101:10,21 103:6,10

103:15,19,23 104:2,12

```
106:12 108:5,8,20,25 110:8
mean (20)
11:25 26:21 29:13,14 30:25
 31:8 40:8,9 45:3,8,19,25
 46:9 47:9.17 52:14 53:11
 83:1 95:6 109:11
meaning (3)
20:20 32:5 71:21
means (6)
18:10 20:15.16 47:3 53:13
 109:8
mechanics (1)
62:25
medical (21)
12:15 52:1.8 56:24 57:2 84:9
 96:14 100:3,4,6,9 101:1,4,8
 102:1,3,5,15,17,23 104:5
meet (1)
35:11
meeting (5)
34:24 35:14 87:10,22 88:1
members (1)
68:1
memo (1)
38:2
memoranda (1)
58:12
memorandum (4)
74:1,3,4 75:20
mention (1)
69:10
mentioned (1)
75:25
met (2)
34:19 35:7
methods (1)
54:18
Metropolitan (3)
3:2 112:21 113:19
Miami (3)
2:6,7 87:22
Michael (1)
2:22
Michelle (2)
64:19,21
Mike (2)
5:15 6:3
Mills (3)
90:9,10 99:6
```

mind (2) 95:14 non-chronological (1) 46:24 103:9 multi-hour (1) 105:20 mindful (20) 37:17 non-lawyer (1) 12:1 16:10 18:22 42:11 48:2 Mutual (4) 38:11 53:25 57:7,13,18 58:4,7 6:22 14:4 15:4 33:5 non-litigation (1) 71:4 76:10,12 81:16 87:23 69:24 N 99:8.9.15 103:3 Norman (1) minority (1) name (14) 69:18 6:3,7 9:7,24 10:5,13 13:6 51:17 North (3) 32:8 36:24 61:21 63:15 minute (2) 2:10,11 25:11 65:1,9 69:12 70:1 74:21 Notary (1) names (2) minutes (1) 111:16 30:1 92:11 35:16 notation (1) nature (3) misinterpreted (1) 81:23 23:2 31:25 40:21 66:2 note (2) near (1) misprint (1) 57:16 92:10 81:3 106:8 notes (1) necessarily (3) misrepresenting (1) 83:7 24:7 46:4,24 44:7 notice (4) need (3) Mississippi (1) 1:18 26:19 27:10 43:15 28:22 84:7 105:16 107:16 noticed (1) needs (1) Missouri (6) 43:13 80:5 1:21 2:20 14:8.22 112:3 notify (1) negative (3) 113:6 26:25 16:1 64:1,2 misspeaking (1) November (5) negotiations (1) 68:13 72:22 73:8 74:5 83:20 101:2 16:8 misunderstood (1) number (12) Neidermyer (5) 76:3 44:24 45:13 76:2 81:9,12,16 63:1,2,17 99:20,23 modified (1) 84:5 95:18 105:23 106:12 never (2) 17:3 106:22 107:25 32:23 100:14 moment (2) numbered (3) new (5) 43:12 105:16 71:7 74:11 92:8 10:15 26:15 64:17 69:21 monetarily (1) numbers (3) 99:25 22:10 29:14 44:20 82:25 Newkirk (21) monitoring (2) numerically (1) 11:8,22 12:24 33:19,20,22 29:9,14 71:6 42:6,11 44:12 45:5 46:22 month (4) numerous (1) 47:1,19 73:3,24 78:3 86:17 19:11,19 48:5 72:12 19:15 86:20 93:7 94:14 97:9 months (3) N-e-i-d-e-r-m-y-e-r (1) Newkirk's (4) 100:7 101:3 102:18 63:17 11:24 43:24 44:10 96:6 Morrison (3) new-be (1) 0 1:20 2:18 113:5 73:12 Motion (1) oath (2) Nick (1) 5:24 62:5 97:15 10:6 object (10) motions (4) nickel (2) 50:14 51:15 58:12 100:18 37:23 43:14 54:16 55:23 20:3,4 multi (1) 78:12 85:4 87:19 88:21 Nine (1) 101:13 108:9 43:12 92:6 objection (35) multiply (1)

paragraph (3) 12:4 19:21 20:5 29:12 30:2 ongoing (3) 38:20,23,25 102:25 104:6 105:11 30:15 33:12 35:19 45:17 paralegal (1) onset (1) 46:21 47:5 50:3,20 53:7,21 65:16 83:11 54:19 65:19 71:25 78:16 parent (1) operation (2) 84:13 87:1,5,11 89:7 93:15 109:17 93:17,22,23 94:9 98:4,21 99:24,25 Park (2) operations (1) 101:18 104:12 108:14 3:47:4 79:20 109:3 opine (1) Parkway (1) obligation (4) 3:3 17:12,23 26:18 95:12 28:3 part (4) opinion (1) obligations (1) 16:4 21:14,15 76:19 29:25 59:23 partake (2) opinions (2) obtained (4) 53:1 60:1 39:20 54:4 48:15,24 49:9,23 participants (3) occasion (1) opportunity (1) 90:12,15,17 37:13 11:19 participate (8) opposed (1) occasionally (1) 34:23 52:22 62:12,22 88:14 59:3 12:14 88:24 89:3,16 order (2) occasions (4) participated (4) 13:12 23:1 58:18 100:20 92:17 101:5 40:17 54:14 62:16 89:23 organization (2) occurred (2) particular (9) 9:1 11:14 62:24,25 12:1 16:5 19:10 21:16 22:3 Original (1) occurrence (2) 60:24 73:14 83:8 110:3 4:11 80:24,25 particularly (1) outside (5) October (7) 31:3 10:21,23 11:9 28:15 102:6 7:2,21,23 9:18 87:9,21 100:2 parties (4) overall (1) offer (6) 17:6,7 57:6 112:12 88:3,7,11,15,19 89:5 18:11 Overland (2) party (1) office (16) 55:22 10:14,21,22,23,24 11:2,5,9 3:47:4 Pat (1) 23:2 30:24 31:9 34:4 40:6 overwhelmed (1) 64:7 64:17 69:22 113:15 80:4 Patricia (1) owner (1) offices (2) 67:14 1:19 31:13 15:7 pay (6) **Ohio** (3) P 1:2 2:24 6:6 21:2,3 22:9 26:16,17 96:4 page (18) payment (5) Okay (12) 3:6 43:12 44:22 75:20 76:2,4 21:21 96:11,19,20 100:14 32:13 43:15 45:1 61:3 72:3 81:12,14 89:11,18 94:20 payments (5) 72:11.21 74:12 86:17 96:4 97:15,24,25 99:5 100:2 19:5 96:8,22,24,25 103:20 108:3 113:10,15 peer (1) old (1) pages (7) 70:12 105:8 30:11,18 38:5,6 50:11 51:13 pendency (1) older (1) 51:15 101:12 91:11 **paid** (8) pending (6) once (5) 18:13.23 20:21 22:19 69:25 6:5 24:6 26:7 28:21 29:23 28:14 29:8 45:11 51:14 96:13 97:13 98:16 102:8 91:17 paper (1) people (3) ones (1) 40:14 9:2 21:11 60:1 101:5

peoples (1)	57:20,24	policyholder (4)
53:1	physical (2)	23:14 24:5 79:16,17
percent (19)	59:3,5	porter (1)
17:11,17 20:9,11 21:21 22:9	Physicians (1)	61:14
22:14 45:23,24,25 46:1,2	6:22	portion (7)
53:8 82:24,25,25 84:6		1 -
	pick (2) 24:23 97:5	7:11,14 28:5,7 50:9 95:15
95:11,19		98:5
percentage (17)	picked (1)	position (9)
16:19 17:23 19:4 20:2,20,21	39:13	6:25 7:3 8:11 9:9 10:8,14,16
21:10 22:12,18 26:16,17	piece (1)	10:17 38:14
44:25 60:11 67:1 84:8	36:9	possess (2)
95:25 96:4	place (5)	48:8 51:13
Perez (2)	26:19 80:21,23 110:2 112:8	possesses (1)
67:14,15	plaintiff (3)	49:21
perfect (1)	1:7 14:22 112:22	possession (4)
70:2	plans (1)	40:24 43:24 44:10 77:7
perform (1)	103:20	possible (2)
25:3	pleading (1)	70:1 86:5
performed (3)	58:9	potentially (1)
98:10,25 99:11	pleadings (9)	41:2
period (13)	50:14 51:16,25 52:7 58:6,6,8	precipitated (1)
10:21 11:2 16:23 21:19,19	58:11 100:18	34:2
24:18 35:4,5 45:20 51:7	please (13)	predate (2)
79:8 84:3 86:4	5:7,22 6:7,8 9:7 21:23 52:5	48:11 50:16
periodically (1)	84:8 91:25 101:22 103:22	predated (2)
96:21	106:23 113:15	48:18 49:5
person (11)	plug (1)	predecessor (2)
8:24 10:15,17 13:5 28:20	29:19	73:1,4
33:18 49:25 62:6 72:5,5	plus (1)	premium (5)
99:23	50:6	20:21 21:2,9,15 22:18
personal (2)	Pluto (1)	preparation (5)
47:10 59:10	64:5	34:12 35:12 36:3 37:18 39:2
personally (3)	PM (1)	Preparing (1)
51:20 66:6 78:23	5:1	35:9
persons (2)	point (11)	present (6)
38:3 59:24	18:7 32:10 33:17,21 35:18	3:1 7:24 102:3,5,15,22
pertain (1)	80:11,14 94:15 99:2,13	presented (1)
80:14	103:2	100:15
pertains (1)	points (1)	presently (3)
76:19	32:20	9:15 95:21 101:9
Peter (3)	policies (11)	president (1)
65:23 68:2,3	12:7,7,10 16:20 20:25 21:7	38:11
PG/LN (1)	23:6 44:24 45:7 46:9 88:8	presumably (1)
114:4	policy (28)	28:15
phone (1)	12:3 16:12 17:13,22 21:1,16	presume (1)
5:17	21:18 22:2 23:15 24:2 27:2	17:1
photograph (1)	45:2,11,13,19,22,24,25 46:8	Pretty (1)
57:21	49:18 56:6,10,11 62:20	43:19
photographs (2)	84:5 85:11 94:25 107:22	previous (3)
Lange alima (=)	Cito Colli / Lind IOI . min	braitons (s)

89:10,17 101:23	41:12,17,21 42:12,13,15,17	27:12
previously (2)	44:17 48:3,14 54:8 55:8,16	pursuant (9)
83:14 85:1	55:25 57:22 66:15 75:3	1:18 22:11 33:9 36:12 39:21
pre-litigation (1)	81:17 82:8 83:14 84:25	41:21 48:15 50:12 113:12
51:2	97:25	put (2)
pre-1998 (1)	produces (1)	10:17 47:1
51:4	53:16	putting (1)
pricing (1)	producing (2)	45:5
28:1	44:11 55:22	
primarily (3)	product (19)	QQ
13:4 27:11 51:15	53:11,25 54:3,5,10,17 55:3	qualifies (1)
prior (21)	71:18 72:7,19 73:20 74:7	102:7
10:19 24:18 27:7 28:18	74:16 75:16 77:17 101:13	question (23)
43:15 48:19,22,25 51:9,18	108:9,14 109:1	16:1 23:19 29:8,22,22 52:3
56:16,18,20,22 62:3 75:14	production (2)	55:1 62:21 64:1 88:23 89:2
78:5 88:10 89:8,9 112:5	39:21 40:18	89:8,9,10,14,15,17,20
privilege (44)	progression (1)	101:19,22,23 108:22,23
19:18 36:13,15,18,22,23,25	9:18	questions (3)
37:1,14,15 54:3,6,11,18	promise (1)	43:7 110:6.8
57:23 60:17 65:11,22 66:11	21:2	quick (1)
66:19 67:18 71:3,18 72:7	properly (1)	43:19
72:24 74:8,17 75:5,8,16,17	43:13	quite (1)
76:8 77:18 78:1,18,22 81:7	proposal (1)	80:18
87:19 88:22 94:19 101:14	88:3	quote (1)
105:18,20 108:10	prosecuting (2)	75:21
i -	65:18 66:3	
privileges (1) 77:16	provide (3)	<u>R</u>
probably (8)	39:9 79:21,23	R (1)
17:3 25:6 30:17 34:22 49:9	provided (6)	112:1
56:14 60:7 102:20	36:20 41:15 58:20 86:18	random (2)
	98:2 107:22	24:23 25:10
problem (1) 103:16	provides (3)	randomly (3)
1	16:18 79:12 85:13	25:19 26:8,11
procedure (1) 96:7	Public (1)	Randy (1)
procedures (1)	111:16	65:23
54:17	111.10 pulled (1)	range (1)
proceed (4)	25:16	102:21
92:10,15 93:4 103:21	purchase (2)	rare (2)
i '	15:22,23	80:23 81:2
proceeding (3)	purchased (11)	rate (1)
13:21 14:5,17	7:11,12 15:11,19 17:22 21:17	82:24
process (2)	21:19 22:2,3,4,16	read (11)
33:7 90:1	purported (1)	38:19 43:12 83:12 89:9,11,16
processed (1)	100:13	89:18 101:21,24 114:17,19
84:3		reader (1)
produce (3)	purportedly (2) 76:5 85:2	43:20
41:24 74:19,24		reading (3)
produced (33)	purpose (5)	33:2 44:5 113:14
17:17 30:11 36:11,14,17,19	100:8 102:16 104:10,15,20	ready (2)
37:14 39:14 40:20 41:4,10	purposes (1)	

25:15 43:18 28:1 29:11 52:2,8 56:24 57:3 109:24 110:3 really (5) 96:14 99:10 100:3,5,6,9 reinsure (2) 28:2 32:23 34:3 49:13 79:9 101:1,4 102:15,17 104:5,9 22:25 30:14 reason (10) 104:15,16,17,18 108:22 reinsured (1) 16:2,3 30:18 54:23 55:21,23 redacted (2) 16:24 72:6,15 113:13 114:4 92:12 94:3 reinsurer (10) reasons (3) reduced (1) 15:5 20:18,22 21:6,14 23:17 16:6 25:21 32:10 112:9 24:8 26:15 93:2,13 Reassurance (10) refer (1) relate (4) 7:7,15 8:2 9:11 13:24 14:25 78:23 51:7 105:10 106:8 108:7 15:2 52:18 55:13 60:10 reference (3) related (2) recall (54) 57:23 71:12 78:11 13:18 76:20 10:5 13:1,3 16:22 25:25 26:3 referenced (1) relates (1) 34:8,9 38:18 49:12,14,18 76:11 105:11 references (3) 51:12 56:5,6,8,22 57:1,2,8 relating (1) 57:9,10,15,17 58:2,5,8,8,9 17:16 71:5 85:10 94:24 59:11,11,16 62:23,23,24 referral (1) relation (1) 63:6,16,22,23 64:3 65:9 80:16 107:9 87:8 88:9 89:24 90:2,3,11 referrals (1) relationship (5) 90:14,16 99:3,12,16 106:19 94:3 16:15 31:20,22 32:1 57:14 107:23 referred (4) relative (2) receive (4) 54:10 66:13 74:21 90:19 112:11,13 52:6,10 85:20 86:2 referring (9) relinquished (1) received (10) 34:16,17 41:2,14,18 50:25 33:22 40:14 41:22 50:7 51:24 75:24 81:1 86:23 remain (2) 83:16 84:2 99:18 100:6 refers (1) 8:18 91:16 102:17 113:16 81:16 remember (3) receivership (1) reflection (1) 9:24 49:16 102:19 14:20 29:10 reorganization (2) receiving (5) reflects (2) 8:23 109:19 18:23,25 19:1 22:17 100:8 87:4 94:23 repeat (2) Recess (1) regard (4) 52:5 91:25 70:24 25:23 33:18 83:10 101:10 report (18) recipient (4) regarding (13) 8:6,24 9:2,3 11:15,17 26:14 72:14 74:13 75:1 78:3 19:13 30:12.13 48:20 49:4 58:5 82:1 84:3,5,9 85:15 recipients (1) 59:13 63:4 84:4 94:20 97:9 94:2 98:2,6 99:5,9 74:22 97:13 100:14 108:6 reported (4) recognize (1) regardless (1) 11:20 29:9 87:23 90:22 65:1 27:15 reportedly (2) recollection (7) reimbursement (4) 75:20 100:2 22:13 38:4 49:8 51:19 62:9 17:14 96:10,12,18 reporter (6) 67:20 99:14 reimburses (1) 42:19 81:7 89:12,19 101:24 recommendation (2) 16:19 112:3 73:17 74:6 reinsurance (31) Reporters (3) record (17) 7:4,6,8,24,25 14:21 15:12,24 3:2 112:21 113:19 5:6 6:8 30:1 37:3,8,9,11,13 16:17 17:5,14 18:3,13,19 reporting (1) 61:9,9,11,12,16 70:23 71:1 20:16.19 22:12 23:3 26:19 9:5 105:17 110:10 26:23 28:11 29:25 30:25 reports (3) records (23) 31:2,9 48:12,16 53:9 83:24 58:3 70:10 98:20

Document 183

(1)	77:5	risk (4)
represent (1)		6:22 18:12 21:11,15
6:4	retain (2)	Ritchey (1)
representation (1)	62:13,16	2:23
66:12	retained (4)	Roberson (4)
represented (2)	10:12 61:25 62:7 106:17	61:20 73:22,25 82:19
84:11 89:25	retention (6)	•
representing (2)	6:23 18:6,9,11,15 19:9	Robert (1)
5:10,13	retired (1)	8:8 D. L. (70)
request (4)	10:4	Roberts (79)
24:21 50:9 114:18,19	retro-session (1)	2:22 3:8 5:14,15 6:2,4 12:6
require (2)	110:1	19:25 20:8 29:21 30:4,21
26:25 43:15	return (4)	33:17 35:22 37:12 38:1
Res (1)	21:15 81:6 89:1 113:15	42:20,24 43:3,9,17,21
86:11	returns (1)	45:21 47:2,11 50:4 51:2
reserve (19)	59:9	53:10,23 54:20 55:2,7,19
27:18,23,24 28:5,7,10,12,17	review (25)	55:24 61:8,17 66:10,16,22
29:4,20 46:9 86:12,13,22	24:25 25:6,7,9 31:6,13 33:4,9	71:2 72:2 78:14,19 82:11
86:23,24 87:4 91:10,19	36:2 37:2 54:2 58:20 60:17	84:15 85:6 87:3,7,15,21
reserved (1)	75:22 76:6,17,25 77:6,7	89:1,13,22 92:14,18,21
27:16	91:6 94:21 97:3,6 99:13	93:20 94:1,11 98:7,24
reserves (8)	104:5	101:15 102:3 103:8,13,17
27:13,14,21 28:22 46:7 91:24	reviewed (9)	103:21,25 104:4,14 105:18
92:2,3	32:24 36:5,22 37:17 39:2	105:25 108:11,18 109:2,6
reserving (1)	43:16 62:19 77:2,8	109:10,16 110:5
28:1	reviews (2)	role (6)
residual (4)	97:4 99:10	39:5,8 63:7 64:22,24 67:10
12:3 83:10,11 107:20	Rice (2)	routine (2)
resources (1)	68:21,22	60:15 104:5
80:6	Rick (1)	runner (1)
respect (5)	67:6	39:13
30:19 31:12 52:14 53:16,17	riders (1)	Russell (1)
respond (4)	22:3	10:13
103:24,25 108:17 109:5	right (48)	RVW (3)
response (2)	10:12 16:11 19:20 23:17	108:24 109:2,14
64:2 85:7	29:11 31:6 32:15 33:11	RVW-IME (1)
responsibilities (3)	41:15 43:1 46:20 47:3 48:6	108:22
12:20 15:4 23:5	48:12,16 55:5 58:20,23	R-E-I (1)
responsibility (19)	66:8,14 71:18,24 73:9 74:7	7:9
12:8,11 19:5 20:9 22:9 23:10	75:16,23 76:7 77:14,17,21	R-e-i-n-s-u-r-a-n-c-e (1)
23:16 24:8 33:22 34:9 46:1	77:25 78:11 82:6 83:25	7:10
64:25 66:23 73:1,8,10 94:7	85:8,15 87:24 88:8 93:4	C
94:16 95:19	94:4,12,21 95:16 97:6	S
responsible (3)	101:6 104:2,7 105:12	sale (2)
50:1 59:24 73:4	rights (1)	7:12,25 Sandia (1)
rest (1)	15:3	Sandie (1)
83:12	ring (2)	64:11
restate (2)	65:12 68:17	satisfied (1)
21:23 88:17	rings (1)	79:22
result (1)	107:3	satisfy (1)

96:23 23:2,22,24 30:24 31:8,10 65:22 saw (2) 85:2 96:9 Shutts (1) 17:16 54:3 separate (1) 2:5 saying (3) 77:16 sign (1) 20:24 21:25 41:1 September (5) 113:15 says (19) 6:21,23 75:14 82:9,14 signature (3) 21:1,6 44:9,23 45:2,21,22,23 series (1) 113:10,15 114:21 45:24 46:7 47:23 55:22 100:3 signed (2) 73:17 81:24 84:2 86:11 served (2) 100:15 113:16 92:21 108:21 109:7 30:9 43:25 significance (2) Schlep (1) service (3) 83:2.7 13:6 79:12,21,22 signing (1) Schmidt (3) services (12) 113:10 66:1 67:23,24 2:5,13,15 5:11,19 7:1 23:25 similar (2) school (2) 31:23 32:4,15 65:16 79:11 11:23 96:2 6:13,14 session (2) Simply (1) Scott (4) 37:18 39:3 60:13 67:19,20 70:7,8 settle (2) single (3) se (3) 93:1,12 37:16 38:25 39:1 23:22 52:24 61:25 settlement (1) sir (11) seal (1) 88:2 6:3 19:11 31:16 34:13 39:6 112:16 seven (1) 42:20,25 43:21 55:2 81:3 second (3) 47:11 108:19 81:12 82:11 85:11 shaking (1) sitting (1) see (15) 55:20 76:10 41:5 42:4 47:13 66:14 75:8 shared (4) situation (3) 76:3 81:14,23 83:20 85:11 58:12,16 65:10 100:19 26:13 27:22 33:3 89:6 92:25 93:11 97:19 shares (1) six (3) 106:7 67:1 10:4 35:7 36:3 seeing (3) sharing (3) Sixteen (1) 49:12.15 59:11 94:24.25 97:10 97:23 seen (6) sheet (3) six-lawyer (1) 36:15 41:6 42:15 43:3 57:21 113:10,15 114:1 37:17 58:21 Shelton (6) Smith (3) select (1) 75:23 85:13 92:7 94:14,20 6:25 7:20 20:25 33:3 97:8 sold (3) selected (1) Shelton's (1) 16:21 21:8 23:7 33:9 85:7 solely (1) self-addressed (1) Shepard (1) 76:20 113:16 101:2 somebody (3) sell (2) short (1) 28:15 51:25 86:19 20:25 21:8 41:19 somewhat (3) Semmler (2) shortened (1) 25:3 47:6 48:22 68:5,6 109:12 sorry (8) send (3) shorthand (2) 24:3 40:16 52:3 68:13 72:16 30:24 80:3 93:7 112:3,8 75:11 104:25 105:21 sense (4) shown (1) sought (3) 40:10 66:2 82:21 95:4 99:20 104:14,18,19 sent (8) shows (1) south (2)

5:7 6:5,7 30:19 31:17 69:14 23:23 87:24 2:6 107:15 **SOUTHERN (1)** 88:19 109:19 111:19 112:3 subsidiary (8) 15:8.16 17:11 22:7.8.17 stated (6) 1:2 50:11 88:16 89:5 92:3 93:21 29:24 32:9 space (1) substance (1) 109:13 112:9 Spaeth (2) statement (2) 113:12 succeeded (1) 10:6.8 28:11 113:13 speak (1) states (3) 10:7 Suite (5) 9:1 1:1 45:9 86:22 speaking (4) static (1) 1:20 2:15,19 3:3 113:5 24:1,2 63:23 64:3 Summary (1) 91:16 97:16 specific (6) status (4) 69:23 94:2 108:6,12 superior (1) 13:19 25:12 49:14,17 51:21 57:17 Stephanie (5) 8:18 2:10 5:20 65:24 69:2,3 supervisor (1) specifically (2) 8:21 24:3 25:20 Steve (2) specimen (1) 68:21,22 Supplemental (1) 99:9 56:11 Stinson (3) 1:19 2:18 113:5 spectrum (1) support (1) 16:20 stipulate (2) 64:24 55:17 66:11 suppose (1) speculate (5) 45:15 46:25 48:14 87:13,17 stipulation (2) 46:6 55:8 66:17 sure (10) spell (1) 10:7 19:2 21:24 23:4 29:13 9:7 storage (3) 40:9,11 81:18 37:6 43:17 45:4 47:17 61:7 spoke (4) 34:14 35:13 61:23 62:10 stored (2) surveillance (7) 57:19 96:14 98:1,3,9,20,25 44:14.18 spoken (2) 62:18 63:20 Strange (1) suspect (2) spreadsheet (1) 67:6 30:18 82:3 100:21 Street (6) swear (1) Springfield (1) 1:20 2:10,15,19,24 113:5 5:22 strengthen (1) Swiss (7) 2:16 staff (1) 27:21 7:11,12 8:19 10:19 15:19,21 strike (1) 42:8 68:7 Staffing (2) 74:20 sworn (3) 7:1,21 subject (11) 5:24 111:11 112:6 29:18 47:10 73:14,16 74:14 system (1) stake (2) 21:21 53:5 75:21 77:20 103:1 106:6,15 27:4 107:1 Stanczak (1) S-c-h-l-e-p(1)submit (1) 13:6 67:21 Standard (1) 84:8 S-e-m-m-l-e-r (1) submitted (1) 5:6 68:5 84:3 S-p-a-e-t-h (1)stands (2) 108:24 109:14 subpoena (7) 10:7 30:10 36:12 39:6,22 41:21 S-t-a-n-c-z-a-k (1) Stange (2) 43:25 55:12 67:21 67:6,8 started (2) Subscribed (1) S-t-a-n-g-e (1) 8:6 9:25 111:11 67:7 subsequent (2) state (10)

Document 183

T **Thank (12)** 55:13 62:14 88:2 5:21 13:9 29:7 43:1,8,16 Tom (1) T (3) 64:5 70:21 87:7 104:3 9:6 2:10 112:1,1 110:5,7 top (1) Tables (1) thick (1) 86:11 29:17 49:10 Topeka (1) take (16) thing (1) 6:14 10:2,6 14:24 26:8 37:2 42:23 96:15 total (2) 43:6,18 60:20 64:20 70:1 things (8) 46:9 87:3 71:15 75:10,19 97:1 105:22 22:5 26:22 47:9,12 50:17,18 **To-Do (3)** taken (3) 51:8 57:25 47:12.16.20 1:16 94:15 112:7 think (17) track (1) takes (1) 27:19 30:10 38:21 43:13 103:9 28:10 47:6 55:25 76:14 81:3 tracking (1) talk (1) 82:18 88:23 89:7 90:5,7 27:4 24:18 93:10,18 95:17 101:3 traditional (1) talked (1) thinking (1) 40:12 101:3 76:18 traditionally (1) talking (4) third (3) 15:20 79:2,4,6 96:13 2:23 57:6 81:14 transaction (4) task (1) thoughts (2) 8:19 10:19 16:5 42:9 93:11 52:25 53:2 transcript (1) tax (2) thousands (2) 92:19 59:9,12 51:13,14 transcripts (8) telephonically (2) three (5) 50:15 52:1,8 58:19,22,23,24 2:8,12 58:21 82:12 92:23 93:6 94:2 58:25 tell (22) time (43) transmittal (2) 6:17 16:8 18:2,9 19:4 20:14 5:5,6 7:3 10:9 11:13 18:8 73:21,24 22:22 26:2 32:19 53:13 19:16 21:19 22:15 25:3,3 transmitted (2) 62:14 67:19 77:2,9 78:21 25:15 32:10,17 35:4,5 37:2 39:17 75:23 86:5 92:5 99:20 107:3.18 37:7,10 43:18,24 44:5 49:8 travel (1) 109:8,14 55:14 61:10,15 63:10 65:21 103:19 ten (2) 68:11 70:20,22,25 73:11,12 treaty (1) 66:7 94:1 91:13,17,19 99:2 101:5 109:25 tenure (1) 102:19 103:2 110:9 112:8 trial (5) 15:15 timeframe (4) 13:14 14:12,18 43:14 106:6 term (7) 10:18 16:22 48:21 73:9 triggered (2) 12:2.13 23:11 46:19 47:7 times (1) 18:5 102:22 53:10.12 56:15 true (3) terms (2) title (6) 22:19 70:19 97:7 22:11 88:22 9:14,15,17,21 11:12 81:25 truly (1) testified (2) titled (1) 113:18 5:24 13:14 100:22 try (2) testify (2) today (7) 20:23 74:25 14:17 55:15 9:18 18:23 19:6 35:11,23 trying (2) testimony (7) 54:14 102:7 37:15 59:7 19:25 25:2,9 41:23 62:5 today's (3) turn (8) 98:18 102:9 5:4 34:13 35:9 71:11 72:2,10,20 80:7 105:19 Texas (1) told (3) 106:20 107:24 68:14

60:25 62:15 77:10 103:10 102:19 turned (1) use (4) 103:23 75:7 wanted (1) 27:17 28:25 43:14 79:11 turning (1) 99:19 88:8 \mathbf{V} Washburn (1) twice (1) vaguely (1) 6:14 45:10 63:15 wasn't (6) two (13) Valerie (4) 16:7 29:8,21 62:6 88:1 97:25 8:22 9:4 10:11 34:19,24 38:2 36:10 37:20 38:8,14 way (7) 38:6 44:24 58:21 70:1 varies (1) 20:23 32:11 33:2 43:13 77:16 97:24 105:7 17:15 85:23 86:6 98:8 type (10) variety (1) **WDDP** (1) 13:21 14:17 21:16,18 22:1 47:9 81:10 46:14,23 49:17 85:20 103:1 various (1) Wednesday (1) types (4) 32:11 12:6,7 23:10 96:17 103:20 vendor (1) week (7) typically (1) 79:24 17:17 30:10 41:22 48:3 96:3 30:7 versus (4) 102:21 103:7 U 17:24 19:6 20:3 26:16 weeks (2) Vice-President (4) **Uh-huh** (2) 102:18 105:7 8:12,15 9:13 11:13 98:14 99:7 weigh-in (1) video (4) ultimately (3) 52:25 37:3 43:13,14 61:9 15:9 22:10 91:12 went (2) Videographer (1) understand (18) 6:21 42:8 6:10 20:24 21:24 26:24 3:2 weren't (1) videotaped (2) 31:25 32:2,20 33:1 37:19 58:7 1:15 5:3 41:3 43:25 44:2 47:17 West (2) virtue (2) 54:24 69:23 71:7 81:20 70:7.8 78:21 82:7 89:14 Western (3) understanding (9) visit (1) 1:3 14:8,22 28:19 35:17 41:16 42:14 24:22 we're (8) 44:1 47:8 73:23 79:19 88:5 voice (1) 8:24 37:8,11 61:4,16 70:23 106:15 understood (1) 71:1 81:3 volume (3) 23:4 we've (3) undertake (1) 30:13 51:13 80:5 10:15,16 84:2 vowel (1) 47:21 Whitney (1) 8:3 UNITED (1) 106:16 vs (4) 1:1 wholly-owned (1) 1:8 111:23 113:7 114:2 University (1) 32:9 31:18 Wichita (1) W unknown (8) 7:1 waiting (1) 72:5,5,13,14 74:13,13,22,22 wider (2) 89:6 Unpaid (1) 40:9.11 Walker (1) 100:22 wife (2) 69:8 unsigned (1) 57:14,16 Walnut (4) 113:17 William (9) 1:20 2:19,24 113:5 unusual (1) 1:15 2:17 3:7 5:3.23 6:9 want (11) 98:23 111:7 113:4 114:3 5:16 21:23 26:8 34:5,6 45:14 updated (1) withheld (12)

53:24 57:24 71:17 72:6,14	36:3	43:22 107:24 108:2,20
72:18 73:15 74:5,6,15		- 100.2,20
75:15 77:16	Z	11
witness (10)	Zahnd (7)	1 (5)
1:16 3:6 5:13,22 42:23 55:14	41:15,17 42:2,4,21 43:4,22	3:11 42:18 66:12 83:23
108:15 109:4 112:6,16	Zahnd's (1)	105:19
wondering (1)	42:16	1:09 (1)
83:15	Zervas (1)	37:11
Woods (1)	65:5	1:40 (1)
10:1	Z-e-r-v-a-s (1)	61:11
word (5)	65:7	1:49 (1)
20:14 45:12 66:3 97:2 109:7		61:16
wording (1)	\$	10 (1)
26:23	\$3500 (1)	3:20
work (24)	95:7	100 (7)
6:21 11:22,25 22:24 42:6		4:5,6 45:25 46:2 82:25 84:6
53:11,25 54:3,5,10,17 55:3	0	84:16
71:17 72:7,19 73:20 74:7	000317 (1)	101 (1)
74:16 75:16 77:17 101:13	81:10	4:7
108:9,14,25	001 (5)	105 (1)
worked (2)	75:19,24 76:1 94:18,21	4:9
6:19 7:2	0025 (1)	1077 (3)
works (2)	100:1	1:18 112:20 113:21
18:3 33:2	005 (3)	11 (2)
wouldn't (1)	75:20 76:2 94:21	3:21 94:12
25:16	010 (1)	12 (2)
write (1)	86:7	3:22 96:2
94:19	011 (1)	12:00 (1)
writing (2)	86:7	5:1
96:6 112:10	01103 (1)	12:11 (1)
written (1)	2:16	5:5
7:19	012 (1)	12:53 (1)
wrote (1)	86:7	37:7
38:9	029 (1)	1201 (3)
	45:22	1:20 2:19 113:5
X	02948 (1)	13 (2)
X (1)	106:3	3:23 97:8
21:9	02949 (1)	13th (2)
	106:4	1:18 5:4
<u> </u>	04 (1)	1391 (1)
year (3)	65:12	2:15
6:15 14:9 21:9	050 (1)	14 (3)
years (11)	92:8	3:24 18:24 97:12
8:22 9:4 10:2,4,11 18:24	0536 (1)	14th (1)
19:11,19 58:11 70:18 78:5	74:11	72:22
yesterday (6)	06 (3)	1466 (1)
34:14,19 35:6 37:18 38:19	68:17 106:11,13	72:20
87:16	069 (1)	15 (4)
yesterday's (1)	45:24	3:25 89:11,18 97:15
	07 (4)	
		ı

26		
2 2 7 22 11 12 27 15	2.11 (1)	28 (1)
3:25 89:11,18 97:15	2:11 (1)	28 (1) 113:2
1500 (1)	70:23	
2:6	2:15 (1)	28th (1)
16 (1)	71:1	107:24
4:2	20 (2)	2800 (1)
1600 (1)	4:6 100:12	95:7
2:15	2000 (5)	2900 (3)
17 (2)	23:24 24:19 27:7 28:18	1:21 2:19 113:5
4:3 99:4	48:11	2941 (2)
18 (2)	2001 (7)	106:11,13
4:4 99:17	56:20,21,22,23 87:9,21 98:2	2948 (2)
184,536 (1)	2002 (6)	105:19 106:1
46:8	37:20 38:2 51:6,8 56:18	2949 (1)
19 (3)	85:25	105:19
4:5 6:20 100:1	2003 (1)	3
1900 (1)	100:2	
2:23	2004 (4)	3 (4)
191 (1)	11:2 12:20 15:18 106:20	3:13 61:13 81:5,9
97:23	2006 (7)	3:12 (1)
1913 (1)	7:2,13 14:10,10 101:3 106:1	110:9
100:13	106:4	30 (1)
1916 (1)	2007 (9)	113:17
68:16	1:19 5:5 17:4 48:6 104:23	3000 (2)
1952 (1)	105:3 111:12 112:17 113:2	50:6,11
91:6	201 (1)	31 (2)
1960's (1)	2:6	104:22 105:3
16:25	205 (1)	316 (2)
1984 (1)	3:3	77:11,13
15:12	21 (1)	317 (1)
1990 (7)	100:21	81:24
6:16,18 48:4,5 49:23 56:1	22 (2)	317,171 (1)
81:22	4:7 101:1	46:7
1990's (1)	23 (1)	3261 (2)
19:2	4:8	106:21,24
1993 (4)	23rd (1)	33 (1)
6:20,21,24 82:10	108:20	81:13
1994 (1)	24 (6)	33131 (1)
71:23	4:9 61:13 81:5 104:22 105:2	2:7
1996 (4)	106:20	3339 (2)
6:24,25 31:20 72:23	26th (1)	107:24 108:2
1997 (5)	96:3	3344 (1)
31:21 33:10,19 92:6 97:20	27 (2)	108:18
1998 (4)	106:1,4	3347 (1)
34:1,11 77:15 94:11	273 (3)	108:18
	29:23,25 30:6	338 (2)
2	27401 (1)	81:25 82:4
2 (9)	2:11	342 (2)
3:12 42:18,20 44:23 82:9,12	2750 (1)	81:14 82:3
86:15,16 87:4	45:2	3500 (1)
<u> </u>		

95:7	60's (1)	3:15,16
360 (1)	17:1	85 (2)
77:12	61 (22)	3:17 15:13
3600 (2)		1
30:11,18	3:11,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20	88 (2)
398 (1)	3:21,22,23,24,25 4:2,3,4,5,6	89:11,18
83:22	4:7,8,9	9
83.22	63 (1) 82:24	9 (3)
4	.	3:19 92:6 97:8
4 (1)	64106 (2)	9th (2)
3:14	1:21 113:6	106:11,13
4th (1)	66210 (1)	90 (2)
43:22	3:4	3:18 48:21
401 (1)	67 (1)	
72:2	46:1	92 (1)
	67.1 (2)	3:19
42 (3)	45:23,23	9200 (1)
3:11,12,12		3:3
44 (2)	7	93 (1)
91:7,13	7 (2)	82:14
45 (2)	3:17 85:6	94 (4)
91:7,14	718 (2)	3:20,21 71:16 83:20
45202 (1)	72:10,16	95 (5)
2:24	75 (2)	72:4,8,13 83:23 84:4
46 (1)	20:12 35:16	96 (16)
91:14	789 (2)	3:22 7:21,21,23 9:18 10:18
47 (1)	71:12,15	11:2 12:8,11,20 24:6 29:2
91:14	792 (2)	32:15 48:21 73:9 74:5
48 (1)	83:3,4	97 (8)
91:14	44-4	3:23,24,25 4:2 32:15 74:10
	8	75:14 91:7
5	8 (5)	98 (10)
5 (2)	3:18 82:9,14 86:7 90:18	49:1,5 50:1 51:7 76:5 77:1
3:15 83:3	8th (1)	85:25 94:15 96:3 97:8
50 (7)	92:6	99 (2)
20:9,11 21:21 22:9,14 53:8	80 (4)	4:3,4
82:24	17:11,17 95:11,19	1.5,1
500,000 (1)	800 (1)	
46:11	71:15	
501,000 (2)	801 (1)	
87:6 91:10	71:15	
501,707 (1)	804 (1)	
86:12	71:15	
508 (1)	81 (1)	
75:10	3:13	
511 (1)	813 (1)	
2:23	82:15	
ture, ture I	826 (1)	
6	2:10	
6 (3)	1	
3:8,16 83:22	83 (2)	